FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 210 *29 October 1979*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

Article by Marshal Ustinov on Soviet Initiatives AA 1
[PRAVDA 25 Oct]
Kondrashov: Aaron Trip Overt Negative Response To USSR AA 9
[IZVESTIYA 25 Oct]
Further Comment [Kondrashov] AA 12
USSR Proposals Vital to World Peace, Balance of Power AA 13
[Kravtsov in NOVOYE VREMYA 19 Oct]
Zorin Views Washington's Reaction to Brezhnev Proposals AA 16
W. European Harping on 'Soviet' Military Threat' Scored AA 17
[Fuchkov in PRAVDA 23 Oct]
Britain Warned Against Deployment of U.S. Missiles AA 20
[Borisov]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Arlyevich, Bovin, Zhishlin]
Brezhnev's Initiatives, Reactions CC 1
Modernization of NATO Weaponry CC 2
Soviet, Middle Eastern Initiatives CC 4
Hua's West European Visit CC 6
Islamic News Agencies Conference Ends CC 8

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S. Pursuing 'Big Stick' Policy in Caribbean [Chigir] A 1
U.S. Naval Actions Scored [PRAVDA 19 Oct] A 2
PRAVDA Cities Congressman's Criticism of Arms for Morocco [24 Oct] A 3
TASS Reports Vance Statement on Insuring U.S. Security A 3
Pentagon Request for Increased Military Spending Noted A 4
House Approval of Arms Bill A 4

CHINA

PRC Defense Minister's Plans on Modernization Criticized B 1
[Lavrov]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Reportage on Assassination of South Korean President C 1
Death of Pak Chong-hui C 1
Declaration of Martial Law C 1
U.S. Troops on Alert C 1
Distrust of Seoul Explanation C 1

U.S. Reaction, 'Involvement' C 2
U.S. Decision To Remove Pak [PRAVDA 28 Oct] C 2
Froklin Commentary C 2
USSR, DPRK Sign Scientific, Technical Cooperation Protocol [Volkov] C 4
Increase in Troops, Arms Seen as Goal of Brown's Trip [Yenikeyev] C 5
Japanese CP Election Successes Hailed [Vdovin in PRAVDA 22 Oct] C 6
Japanese Prime Minister Calls for Buildup of Military Might C 8

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

PRC Continues Provocations Along Border with Vietnam E 1
New Kampuchean Ambassador Presents Credentials to Kuznetsov E 1
Tension Developing on Thai-Kampuchean Border E 2
PRAVDA Correspondent Interviews Kampuchean Defense Minister [Shchedrov, 24 Oct] E 3

WESTERN EUROPE

IZVESTIYA Reports Opening of WEU Arms Colloquium in Brussels [Ryzhov, 17 Oct] G 1
'Obedient Tool of NATO' [Ryzhov in IZVESTIYA 19 Oct] G 1
France, FRG Resist Nus's Attacks on USSR [Sobolev, Zapevalov] G 2
Arkhipov Receives UK Minister of State for Trade in Moscow G 3
End of Commission Session G 3
Italy, USSR Sign Economic Agreement in Rome G 4
NATO Pressures Portugal to Increase Defense Spending [Vladimirov] G 5

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Further Reportage on USSR Visit of PDRY Leader H 1
Leningrad Meeting With Romanov H 1
Sightseeing in Leningrad H 1
Departure From Leningrad H 1
USSR-PDRY Treaty [PRAVDA 26 Oct] H 2
Ulsterumskiy Commentary H 5
Timoshkin Commentary H 6
PDRY Paper Cited [ATH-THAWRI] H 7
Soviet TV Interview H 7
Iranian Oil Workers Demand U.S. Extradite Shah H 8
U.S. Attitude Change Marks Shah's 'Opportune' Entry [Savchenko] H 8
Iranian Customs Discover Documents, Films in U.S. Baggage H 9
Iranian Commission To Be Sent to Kordestan H 9
Economic Difficulties Add to Problems in Iran [Svetozarov in KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA 18 Oct] H 9
Tense Situation Continues in Iranian Kordestan H 11
Iranian Paper Reports SAVAK Agents' Plot [ETTELA'AT] H 11
Dayan Cited on Israeli Plans To Expand Settlements [Dashkov] H 12
Saudi King Calls for Restoration of Palestinian Rights H 12
Commentary Praises Soviet-Algerian Relations [Antonov] H 12

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

PRAVDA Deems Secret S. African Nuclear Test 'Extremely Likely' [Korovikov, 27 Oct] J 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Supreme Soviet Scheduled To Meet 28 November R 1
Shevardnadze Delivers Report at Georgian Party Plenum R 1
Unveiling of Monument R 1
Electronics Minister Decorated for Services R 1

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Industrial Figures for Third Quarter Released S 1
PRAVDA Editorial Points Out Need To Improve Material Supply Work [23 Oct] S 1
CPSU Official Opens Zonal Energy-Saving Conference in Estonia [SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 18 Oct] S 3
Gosplan Official Writes on Metal Saving [Ryzhkov in IZVESTIYA 20 Oct] S 3

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Radio Reports Agricultural Developments 27-28 Oct T 1
27 October T 1
28 October T 1
CSA Data on Grain Sales in Oblast, ASSR T 1
Grain Harvest Ends in Kazakhstan T 1
Details on Harvest T 2
Aliyev Pegs Azerbaijan Grain Harvest at 260,000 Tons T 2
[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 14 Oct]
Briefs: Primorskiy Kray Harvest T 2

ARTICLE BY MARSHAL USTINOV ON SOVIET INITIATIVE

LD271307 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 79 pp 4-5 LD

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister: "Military Detente Is the Imperative of the Time"--capitalized passages published in boldface]

[Text] The new Soviet peace initiative remains at the center of international attention. The proposals put forward by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, during his recent visit to the GDR are being actively discussed by governments, political parties, social organizations and the broad public. This initiative, as the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers document notes, "has opened up an opportunity to prevent a new upswing in the arms race, to embark on the path of real disarmament and to protect and augment the fruits of detente and peaceful cooperation."

The Soviet proposals have encountered the full approval and wholehearted support of the entire Soviet people, the socialist community countries' peoples and the world's progressive people. Their implementation would be of tremendous importance primarily from the viewpoint of supplementing political detente with military detente and creating favorable potential for consolidating relations of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. Prominent politicians and statesman of the most diverse countries are noting this.

At the same time forces which have not found the USSR initiative to their liking have also emerged. Leading circles--primarily those of the United States, the FRG and Britain--are seeking to avoid making a specific response to it and to belittle the importance both of the constructive steps taken by the Soviet Union and of the proposals it submitted. They would like to substitute propaganda battles for specific work together with the socialist community countries on the issues of military detente and, under cover of those battles, to implement their schemes hostile to the cause of peace. These circles are essentially attempting to convince the world public and primarily the West European countries that, despite everything and in defiance of commonsense, the NATO bloc must continue the course of building up the arms race in West Europe and start deploying in that region qualitatively new American nuclear-missile systems.

Without troubling itself over proof and juggling the facts for want of proof, the NATO leadership makes reference to that aggressive alliance's "lag" behind the Warsaw Pact states in terms of many types of weapons, to "dangerous disproportions" in medium-range [srednego radiusa deystviya] weapons and to the "mounting military threat" from the Soviet Union. None of these arguments are new. Every thesis here is false. Militarist circles have always resorted to falsity when they needed to start a new spiral of the arms race.

1.

The whole world knows the statement by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev defining with the utmost clarity the essence and foundations of the Soviet Union's military doctrine. He said: "We are not seeking military superiority. It has never been, nor is it part of our intentions to threaten any state or group of states. Our strategic doctrine has a purely defensive thrust." The chairman of our country's Defense Council expressed in that laconic formula the general line of the Communist Party and the Soviet state in the defense sphere.

Throughout its history, starting with Great October, the Soviet Union has strictly and consistently subscribed and continues to subscribe to precisely such a defensive doctrine. From the first days of Soviet power, during the civil war and the military intervention, we had to defend with weapon in hand our socialist gains against many enemies. As early as those years the foundations of our military doctrine and its defensive character were laid down. During the Great Patriotic War the Soviet people selflessly defended their freedom and independence against the fascist invaders. The defensive character of our military doctrine at that time has no need of proof. Defending their motherland, the Soviet people and their armed forces utterly routed the aggressor and made the decisive contribution to achieving victory and to delivering the world's peoples from fascist enslavement. But that victory cost us the lives of 20 million Soviet people. And we cannot forget that.

Of course, we take into account the grim experience of World War II in building and improving the armed forces. Even since the Great Patriotic War our military policy has still been determined by love of peace and the need to insure effective defense of the socialist homeland. The defensive character of Soviet military doctrine is clearly expressed in the 24th and 25th CPSU congresses' decisions. It is enshrined in legislative form in our country's Constitution. The doctrine's basis is the defense of our people's socialist gains and peaceful labor and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Soviet state and its allies. Such is the truth. It is incontestable. And no one can be allowed to distort it.

The attempts by NATO military leaders to deny Soviet military doctrine's defensive character by citing our armed forces' might and their ability to rout any aggressor who might risk unleashing war are futile. This device is not new but it does not hold water. The whole world knows that the Soviet Union is not preparing for an armed attack on anyone and will never perpetrate such an attack. The whole world also knows that the Soviet Army and Navy are indeed ever ready to repel an attack from any aggressor, whatever means and methods of warfare he might use. Retribution for an attack on the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries will be unavoidable. We say that with the utmost clarity.

The Soviet leadership's clear understanding of what war would mean for mankind under modern conditions predetermines the USSR's active position. There is now no reasonable alternative to peaceful coexistence. Its principles are being asserted increasingly broadly in the practice of interstate relations. It was at the initiative of the socialist community countries that the all-European conference which adopted the Final Act--a kind of charter of security for Europe's peoples, a charter of peaceful life--was convened. Talks aimed at a complete and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests, a ban on radiological weapons and a number of others are being held with active participation by the USSR. We are seeking to insure an end to production of nuclear weapons and the gradual reduction of stockpiles of them until they are completely eliminated, along with a simultaneous strengthening of international legal and political guarantees of states' security, so that nuclear energy is used for peaceful purposes alone. The Soviet Union is pressing for the speediest completion of the preparation of treaties and conventions which would end the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, stipulate the destruction of stocks of them and ban the creation of new types and systems of mass-destruction weapons. In the struggle to achieve these noble aims the Soviet Union cooperates closely with the other socialist countries.

The treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments (SALT II) signed by the Soviet Union and the United States is designed to play an important role in stabilizing the international situation. The United States allowed itself many hesitations and zigzags in the process of its elaboration. But eventually the document was signed. It represents a carefully weighed balance of the interests of the two biggest nuclear powers. At the same time the SALT II treaty accords with the peaceful aspirations of all peoples.

The Soviet Union attaches paramount importance to the fact that at the same time that they signed the SALT II treaty, the USSR and the United States agreed to continue talks in which, in accordance with the principle of equality and identical security, they will seek significant and substantial reductions in the quantities of and qualitative restrictions on strategic armaments. It is important that no additional artificial obstacles emerge on this path and that the efforts to reach consensus be mutual, consistent and continuous.

However, the question arises: What has the United States been driving at lately and are not its practical steps since the signing of the SALT II treaty leading to serious complications which will make the prospect of SALT III more remote and will burden Soviet-American relations? The question is a legitimate one. For there is a buildup in the aggressiveness of the NATO bloc, in which the United States sets the tone, and an intensification of U.S. military preparations in various regions of the world.

II.

Verbally, the U.S. leaders also seem to advocate the development of peaceful cooperation between states, the relaxation of tension and its buttressing by military detente. However, their practical deeds often testify to the reverse: They are fueling an atmosphere of fear, spurring on their arms race and overtly carrying out war preparations.

U.S. Defense Secretary H. Brown has openly declared that the U.S. aim is to insure by the mid-eighties NATO military superiority over the Warsaw Pact states. And here it is specified that what is at issue is nuclear superiority providing the United States with the "potential for assured destruction."

Just recently the debate about the expediency of delivering "in certain circumstances a preventive strike" employing strategic weapons against military targets on the Soviet Union's territory has been revived in the United States. It is not very clear just now, given the present state of strategic nuclear forces and guidance facilities for them, responsible people can even think about such strikes, since it is perfectly obvious that they would inevitably be followed by a mighty counterstrike.

How is the Soviet Union to react to such statements? How should the claims by high-ranking U.S. representatives that "the whole globe is now part of NATO's sphere of interests" be interpreted? It is clear to everyone--and not merely to military specialists--that this is not just talk. Specific plans and studies [razrabotki] of a war aimed against the USSR and its allies and reactionary imperialist circles' expansionist and hegemonist policy lie behind it.

It is in the spirit of these aggressive aims and in accordance with a military doctrine incorporating the infliction of preventive strikes on a probable adversary that the U.S. Armed Forces are being built: A program to create a system of MX mobile missile complexes [sistema mobilnykh raketnykh kompleksov "mix"] is being implemented; strategic missile submarines carrying the new Trident-1 missile began to be used by the U.S. Navy in October; trials of cruise missiles with a range of 2,600 km are being completed and preparations have been made for them to enter service; the creation of new more powerful warheads for the Minuteman intercontinental missiles is nearing completion; the intensive development of mass-destruction weapons based on new principles of operation is under way.

In parallel the United States is planning to create and move up to the borders of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries new systems of medium-range weapons designed to fulfill strategic tasks. It is planned to deploy in West Europe about 600 cruise missiles and Pershing-II ballistic missiles. The implementation of this plan would have the aim not simply of supplementing the approximately 1,500 units comprising the U.S. forward-based facilities already there and the corresponding facilities of Britain and France capable of reaching Soviet territory, but also thereby of altering the strategic situation in Europe in NATO's favor. This would place the Soviet Union at a disadvantage in comparison with the United States, would entail an increase in the might of the U.S. strategic nuclear forces and would force the Soviet Union to adopt the appropriate retaliatory measures.

Attempts are being made in NATO circles to pass off this plan to deploy medium-range nuclear devices in Europe as "upgrading armaments" ["dovooruzheniye"], as the "modernization" of armaments. But in reality it is U.S. strategy that is being modernized and becoming more aggressive. Under this strategy weapons sytems are being expedited which, as Comrade L.I. Brezhnev graphically stated, represent a mine placed under the edifice of European peace, under its very foundation. The size of the NATO bloc's armed forces is being increased, and they already number in Europe more than 3 million men. The system of control and interoperability is being improved. In addition, the rearmament of all branches of the armed forces and categories of troops with new weapons is proceeding apace. Enormous stockpiles of arms and equipment for U.S. troops who are to be transferred to Europe in so-called crisis situations are being set up on the territory of West European states. The combat capabilities of military transport aviation and airborne troops are being built up.

Europe is not the exception. The U.S. military presence is Japan in being reinforced. NATO is examining the possibility of delivering modern weapons to China and is encouraging Beijing's war preparations aimed against neighboring states. In the Near East attempts are being made under U.S. auspices to cobble together a new aggressive alliance with the participation of Israel, Egypt and certain other countries. The formation of a 100,000-strong "quick-reaction corps" designed to perform "punitive functions" is going ahead at full speed. The United States is deploying a permanent fleet in the Indian Ocean Zone, refusing to heed the protests of the states of the region. Thus the facts demonstrate that it is NATO and the United States, under cover of a nonexistent "Soviet military threat," that are constantly building up armaments aimed against the Soviet Union.

At the basis of the decisions which the United States is foisting on the NATO bloc lies the gamble on force as the chief means of implementing imperialist policy. Such a development would result not only in the destabilization of relations between the United States and the USSR but also in a general worldwide instability and the absence of a clear prospect of peace.

It is not unlikely that this would suit in the best possible way those influential circles in the United States and other imperialist countries which fear peaceful coexistence and link the future of their class with the arms race and the policy of militarism. In their time these circles unleashed the cold war. They offered virulent resistance to the emergence of detente. Their thoughts and actions are invariably concentrated upon hurting the positions of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

However, the times when aggressive forces could with impunity administer justice and reprisals on other people have long passed--and have gone forever. Those people who solicit military advantages and superiority and who brandish their weapons must know: They may burn their fingers' badly. If in defiance of common sense and in disregard of the good will of the socialist countries the NATO countries transform West Europe into a launching pad for U.S. strategic weaponry, then they will encounter the firm and convincing response of the other side.

Europe, like no other region of the world, is saturated, oversaturated with weapons. There has long been a need to tackle seriously the reduction of the level of confrontation of the two main groupings of armed forces located there. And it is our conviction that this is a perfectly feasible task. Why then in this case is it not being resolved? Because there is no end of people in the West who like to measure their own and other people's interests using different yardsticks. This also conceals the reason for the fact that the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe, just as many other disarmament negotiations, have been marking time for so long.

III.

The Soviet Union proposes--and has again been noted most definitively by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev--to examine at appropriate forums the entire range of problems of military detente and to reach agreements, each of which would continue and supplement the other. There are no types of weapons and military problems which the Soviet Union wishes to place outside the limits of any settlement--on condition that other countries too adhere to just such an approach.

Real steps to curb and reduce states' military potentials should, in our opinion, be combined with measures to reduce the danger of an accidental nuclear or nonnuclear conflict and to render difficult the covert preparation of a sudden attack. This will allow the machinery of states' cooperation to be made more stable and will permit the preparation of conditions for decisions in the disarmament sphere which are considerably weightier in both the quantitative and qualitative respects.

A comprehensive approach and the desire to embrace the main components of military detente in Europe also distinguish the Soviet proposals revealed by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev in Berlin. These proposals are convincing proof of our love of peace and our good will. Simultaneously they demonstrate the strength of the Soviet state's international positions, its confidence in its own strength and capabilities.

Comrade L.I. Brezhnev declared THE READINESS TO REDUCE IN COMPARISON WITH THE PRESENT LEVEL THE NUMBER OF MEDIUM-RANGE NUCLEAR DEVICES deployed in the western regions of our country, on condition that no additional U.S. medium-range nuclear devices designed to alter the strategic situation in Europe are deployed in West Europe. What is at issue here is both a quantitative reduction of Soviet nuclear devices and a reduction in the yield of their nuclear charges.

It would seem that if the governments of the NATO countries really want talks on questions of medium-range weapons [orushiye sredinego radiusa deystviya], then it would have been natural for them to display interest in the Soviet proposal and to define the possible basis for talks. But no! Nothing of the sort has happened. Immediately following Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's speech the United States categorically demanded of its allies that there be no change in the prepared decisions concerning the deployment in Europe of new U.S. medium-range nuclear devices.

In planning the deployment of new nuclear devices in Europe the leadership of the United States and those figures in West Europe who support its plan remain silent about the fact that, in the event of the deployed weapons being brought into action by their owners, retaliatory actions [otvetnyye deystviya] will also ensue against the corresponding West European countries. Thus, the realization of these plans would increase for West Europe a danger which it would be completely possible to avoid since the Soviet Union--as Comrade L.I. Brezhnev reemphasized" will never employ nuclear weapons against states which renounce the production and acquisition of such weapons and do not have them on their territory."

Public opinion in the West is being deceived also on another important issue. The number of Soviet medium-range devices deployed in its western regions is comparable with the number of similar devices possessed by Britain and France alone. At the same time, many hundreds of American delivery vehicles for nuclear devices sited aboard aircraft carriers constantly cruising close to the territory of the USSR and also sited at airbases of the European NATO countries are deliberately left out of the reckoning. If you take into consideration all the devices comprising the forward-basing system and intended for actions against targets on Soviet territory, then you get a completely different picture than that being drawn by Western propaganda. Even now this is causing us legitimate concern.

The public is being misled on yet another issue: The December session of the NATO Council will in no way be examining plans to replace the systems constituting the U.S. arsenal in Europe with new systems, but a program for a radical quantitative and qualitative change in the U.S. nuclear potential located in that region and intended for the solution of strategic tasks. The desire at all costs to pass off NATO's aggressive plans as "modernization," "as an enforced retaliatory measure" is pushing the leaders of this bloc into distortion of the facts and misrepresentation of the meaning of the Soviet proposals concerning the reduction of medium-range nuclear weapons.

One can only wonder at the free interpretations which the West's most highly placed figures are permitting themselves in connection not only with what the Soviet Union has done and is doing to strengthen its defense but also regarding its intentions. Indeed, the Soviet Union is renewing the medium-range nuclear devices which have been in its arsenal for some decades now. However, the number of medium-range nuclear weapons delivery vehicles on the European territory of the USSR has not been increased by us over the last 10 years by a single missile or by a single aircraft. There has even been a reduction in their number, as in the yield of their nuclear charges.

Motivated by the sincere desire to show an example of movement from words to real deeds, the Soviet Union, following consultation and in agreement with its allies, adopted A DECISION ON THE UNILATERAL REDUCTION OF THE NUMBER OF SOVIET TROOPS IN THE GDR. In the coming 12 months up to 20,000 Soviet servicemen, 1,000 tanks and a certain quantity of other military hardware are to be withdrawn into the USSR. Everyone understands what is represented by the withdrawal of such a major contingent of troop units from an area in which the sides' armed forces directly confront each other.

It is being acknowledged in NATO's leadership circles that this decision was completely unexpected for them, and they are seeking in every possible way to minimize its significance. But those who endeavor to diminish the significance of the Soviet Union's decision find that they are contradicting themselves. Not long ago NATO's representatives at the Vienna talks advocated the simultaneous Soviet withdrawal from central Europe of 68,000 servicemen and 1,700 tanks and U.S. withdrawal of 29,000 servicemen, 90 nuclear weapon delivery vehicles and 1,000 nuclear devices. They treated this proposal as a most important condition of military detente. Yet suddenly our decision on a unilateral withdrawal of a major contingent of troops proves--according to NATO figures--to be irrelevant. Clearly it is hard to make both ends meet when the desire to conduct matters honestly is absent.

Judging by everything, the NATO leadership is pursuing the aim first of "upgrading" [dovooruzhit] this bloc's armament and then moving on to negotiate with the Soviet Union "from a position of strength" the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. Clearly, the parity which the Western countries' official representatives have talked of more than once does not suit the NATO strategists. Therefore, they are pushing for an arms buildup.

As for the Soviet Union, it proceeds from the immovable principle of equality and indentical security. And if anyone expects that the process of reducing armed forces in Europe will make further headway only at the expense of the USSR and its allies, that person is making a big mistake. Only on the basis of reciprocity do we intend to hold talks with Western countries, including in Europe.

Proposals of great importance were submitted by L.I. Brezhnev CONCERNING THE FURTHER EXPANSION OF CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES IN EUROPE. Such measures stem from the Final Act of the all-European conference. The Soviet Union proposes as yet another step toward military detente to cease, on a reciprocal basis, holding military exercises involving more than 40,000-50,000 men, and to give notice of major ground forces' exercises not 3 weeks but 1 month in advance and at a level not of 25,000 but of 20,000 men, and also to give notice of the movement of ground forces' involving more than 20,000 men. From the viewpoint of insuring the sides' security and deepening trust between them, the implementation of the said proposals would add substantially to the relaxation of tension.

Naturally, the proposals of the USSR and the other socialist countries concerning notification of major air force and naval maneuvers carried out close to the territorial waters of other states that participated in the all-European conference remain in force.

It is hardly possible to think seriously about trust if the scale of troop exercises is increasing from year to year, as is the case with NATO in Europe. Several hundred thousand troops from all branches of the armed services participate in each of the bloc's troop maneuvers. An enormous quantity of diverse weaponry is tested in these maneuvers. Many such exercises are of a strategic scope and serve the practical rehearsal of military actions against the Warsaw Pact states.

As Comrade L.I. Brezhnev has observed, the USSR is ready to examine other ideas aimed at reinforcing trust between states and at reducing the danger of the outbreak of war in Europe. Immediately following the SALT II treaty's entry into force we are prepared to begin important negotiations on SALT III. The Soviet Union consents to discuss at them the possibilities of limiting not only intercontinental but also other types of armaments, with consideration for all associated factors.

Profoundly correct are those responsible political figures, including those in the West, who believe that the Soviet proposals formulated in Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's Berlin speech have created a largely new situation and have redistributed the landmarks for military detente in Europe. If there is in the West the elementary desire to reach agreement, then the basis for this is present on our side--a solid basis which creates real conditions for rapid progress. The ball is in the West's court.

But if those who now determine the policy of the United States and of certain other NATO countries brush aside the available opportunity to reach agreement on real military detente and on insuring Europe's peaceful future, if they prefer attempts at diktat "from a position of strength" and the revival of the cold war to a policy of honest understandings and mutual trust, then these people will bear a heavy responsibility before the peoples of their own and other countries.

The Soviet Union undeviatingly and consistently pursues a peace-loving policy. Of course, it has to take into consideration the fact that forces are active in various parts of the world which are interested in fueling tension and in an arms race, and that there are circles which nurture aggressive plans. Therefore our armed forces are always in step with modern requirements, in constant readiness to deal a determined rebuff to any aggressor.

Rallied closely around the party and its Leninist Central Committee, the servicemen of the army and navy--just like all Soviet people--unanimously approve and support the new peace initiatives advanced by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev. The wisdom, farsightedness and just nature of these initiatives impart to the Soviet people new strength and energy in the accomplishment of the great tasks of communist building.

KONDRASHOV: AARON TRIP 'OVERT NEGATIVE' RESPONSE TO USSR

LD261205 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Oct 79 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[Political observer S. Kondrashov article: "Around One Tour"--capitalized passages published in boldface]

[Text] Washington envoy David Aaron's tour of West European countries (Italy, the FRG, Belgium, the Netherlands and Britain) has been covered only extremely sparesely in by the Western press. Of course, the pomp of ceremonial meetings and sendoffs, state dinners and press conferences are in terms of rank, inappropriate to someone who is merely the U.S. President's deputy assistant for national security affairs. But that is not the point. That is not the reason for the scantiness of the press reports--the reason lies in the covertness of the mission itself. It does not need the public's attention. More, such attention is contraindicated to its nature and its tasks.

Essentially Aaron's trip was the White House's first PRACTICAL move in response to the Soviet peace initiative expressing the readiness to reduce, by comparison with their present level, the number of medium-range nuclear weapons deployed in the Soviet Union's western regions if there is no additional deployment of such weapons in West Europe. The first PRACTICAL move and an ove~tly negative one. That is why the West European public is not being initiated into the point of this move but is being presented with a more attractive propaganda mixture in which meat and fish, acid and sweet are combined in one dish--bows to "positive elements," the venom of skepticism and direct rejection of the Soviet proposals. David Aaron, with his small group, is cruising round West Europe as Washington's traveling salesman or, more simply, as promoter of the Pershing II missiles and medium-range cruise missiles, and he is cruising round precisely those countries in which Washington would like to deploy them.

The urgent nature of his mission, which began less than 2 weeks after the Soviet initiative was put forward, attests that Washington is losing no time, fearful that Moscow's action might "soften" and "disunite" West Europe. Washington is not sitting idly by, waiting for the December session of the NATO Council where the question of producing and deploying the new U.S. missiles will be on the agenda. It intends to decide the matter in advance, as soon as possible, imposing its own position on others. "President Carter would very much like the NATO nuclear planning group to take a decision when it meets in the Hague in November," London's THE DAILY TELEGRAPH writes in connection with Aaron's trip. In that case the ministers who are to meet in Brussels in December would have no fundamental questions left, merely "details concerning the deployment and purchase" of the new missiles.

On investigating the responses to the Soviet initiative which, rocking the world, remains the focus of its attention. You note again that the comments from Washington are the harshest, leaving emphatically no hope. With the passage of time their harshness is being revealed increasingly. This is a whole campaign--both a propaganda campaign and a campaign in the sphere of practical promptings and pressure.

Advancing a fundamentally new idea, the Soviet Union is proposing cooperation to reduce military antagonism in Europe. The United States, in accordance with its "dual formula" for Soviet-U.S. relations, is translating this cooperation into the plane of rivalry. Moreover, it also wants to infect West Europe with the spirit of defiance, halting attempts at a constructive approach by its allies and thus encouraging not the most sensible but the most impudent rightwing elements there, like Strauss in the FRG. As was to be supposed, the line of NATO's Brussels headquarters merges with Washington's line. To judge, for instance, by his interview with the Dutch radio and television company Avro, NATO Secretary General Luns is wholly in favor of the U.S. system of priorities--to sit down at the East-West conference table only after deciding on "arms upgrading."

The Europeans are being intimidated more zealously than usual. The olive branch extended from the East has aroused apocalyptic visions across the Atlantic. These visions are of U.S. origin but they are made out to be West European ones. One specimen was offered recently by the New York TIMES, taking as its theme "the abiding doubts in West Europe as to whether the United States will risk devastation of its own territory for the sake of its allies' defense." There follows an illustration of these "abiding doubts": "If Cologne is seized or subjected to a nuclear attack, will the United States embark on a strike against Kiev, knowing that it will thus jeopardize Chicago?"

What can be said of this scenario? It is a special madness which poses as the super-rationalism of the nuclear missile age and which is being imposed on people in place of sanity. It is now acting under the slogan of "arms upgrading." What a strange word! The world has been indulging in "arms upgrading" throughout the postwar period. Until recently this process was called by the old name "arms race." The world has been indulging in "arms upgrading" for over 30 years--and has by no means become more secure. Now West Europe is being offered the same thing: just one more time--just one more, just a tiny bit, "let's upgrade our arms...." What an absurd figleaf! But a heavy one, too. It may cost further tens of billions of dollars. And, moreover, increase the threat of war. And again end in the infinity of a pitch-dark tunnel.

Soviet military superiority in Europe is the chief argument of those militarists, both willing and unwilling, who are defending "modernization" and "arms upgrading." The situation, they say, needs to be rectified by supplementing the existing Soviet-U.S. balance of intercontinental strategic arms, as enshrined in the SALT II treaty, with a European balance. There are many arguments--and they have been repeatedly cited--which prove the falsity and farfetched nature of this basic premise. Let us try to rely, for example, on the assessment of such a gentleman as Joseph Luns who, undoubtedly, shows concern for NATO's interests. "If we look at all types of arms as a whole," he declared in the aforementioned interview, "then an approximate parity of forces exists between NATO and the Warsaw Pact."

So what is the matter? And why does Washington want to close and, as far as possible, to batten down everywhere those doors which have been blown open by the wind of hopes?

Among the factors which hinge on the complex relations among states with different socio-political systems, I should like to single out a particular one. It relates to the United States and, to be more precise, to the imperial thinking of the U.S. ruling class. Bowing before the facts, Americans pay lipservice to the principle of parity and equal security as the only reasonable basis for relations with the Soviet Union. But their thinking is reluctant to come to terms with parity and remains as it used to be--presumptuously imperial--and it dictates those actions in which a nostalgia for lost supremacy is clearly discernible, and not just nostalgia but also a persistent, dangerous desire to regain supremacy.

Everyone who has taken the trouble to ponder Washington's foreign policy and some of its concrete actions is familiar with this very important feature of U.S. psychology. Politicians in Western Europe maintain a diplomatic silence about this "weakness" of their senior partner and patron but even they sometimes blurt out utterances on this score. Thus, in a recent NBC interview Willy Brandt said of the Americans: "They believe that the United States must without fail be stronger than the Soviet Union and that this is a law of nature...." aptly put: "a law of nature...." [paragraph continues]

They want to "upgrade arms" just a little in order to assert this law. But the whole illusion is that this is not a law of nature but their imperial and imperialist delusion. This law cannot be asserted. The world has changed and moved on. It cannot be developed in another direction. But all the same the Americans are trying to do so and they are passing off their desire for superiority as a struggle against the "Soviet military threat," which they detect throughout the world with increasing frequency. But after all, this is not a "Soviet military threat" but it is merely the fact--true, a very considerable one--that the Soviet Union occupies the position of a world power. "We must reconcile ourselves to this, as a fact of actual reality," Willy Brandt advises his U.S. friends and colleagues. Alas, not everyone wants to reconcile himself to this. And so, to consider merely the events of recent weeks, the Cuban pseudocrisis is fanned and the Soviet peace initiative concerning the reduction of military confrontation in central Europe is given a hostile reception.

Both Washington's official commentaries and actions by Washington like dispatching David Aaron on his West European trip ought to be placed in the broader context of the now dominant sentiments in the U.S. capital. The "doves" of the late sixties and first half of the seventies have mutely shrunk into their feathers and, adapting to the circumstances, have carried out the cosmetic operation of changing their plumage. The "hawks," having driven the "doves" into a corner, are now looking menacingly even at middle-of-the-road political birds, so to speak.

Informed observers are noting, not without some alarm, that the political center itself, which sets the tone of political life, has shifted to the right. They are saying that the so-called "post-Vietnam syndrome" caused by the defeat of U.S. imperialism in Southeast Asia has already been overcome, and that it is time for America once again to "show itself" to the world by means, let us suppose, of "quick-reaction corps." There is not even any talk of reducing military spending (almost the last time that Americans heard about this was in 1976 in the current President's preelection promises), and new military appropriations are demanded without hesitation and are even more readily approved, even augmented, on Capitol Hill. Finally, even the discussion of the SALT II treaty in the Senate is taking place to the accompaniment of demands from senators for comprehensive "arms upgrading" and corresponding assurances by the administration.

In our view it is worthwhile examining in precisely this context the U.S. Government's attitude toward the Soviet initiative. New arms race channels are being sought and here, if you please, is one of them--about 600 units of "Eurostrategic weapons"--as a healing balm for the senators who have still not forgotten and aforementioned "law of nature" and who care little what kind of shadow these U.S. missiles cast upon the security of the European Continent. Immediately after the entry into force of the SALT II treaty, the Soviet Union proposes that SALT III talks be commenced, agreeing to discuss at these the possibilities of limiting not only intercontinental but also other types of arms too. But across the ocean new missile systems are being fitted out as preparation for these new talks, which are of such importance for Europe.

It is in this kind of "domestic" political climate and, moreover, in the runup to the elections that official Washington is attacking the Soviet peace proposals. In order not to be taken in, Western Europe should give serious thought to this self-interest of America's.

Further Comment

LD270235 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Stanislav Kondrashov commentary]

[Text] The current tour of the West European capitals by the United States deputy national security adviser, David Aaron, should probably be seen as the first countermove by the White House to the latest Soviet peace initiative. The Soviet Union said among other things that it's ready to cut the number of its medium-range nuclear missiles sited in its western region on the condition that no additional NATO weapons of this class are deployed in Western Europe. Most observers now agree that David Aaron has been sent on a promotion tour for Pershing II missiles and medium-range cruise missiles. The rather urgent nature of his mission proves that Washington lets not grass grow under its feet in anticipation of the NATO Council session in December, which will consider the production and deployment of what are now described as Eurostrategic weapons.

The Americans, it seems, are determined to decide the issue as quickly as possible and make their West European partners accept their plan. So what's behind this notably rigid American stand? There's at least one main reason for it. This is obviously related to the imperial ways of thinking of the U.S. establishment. In words Washington accepts the principle of parity and equal security as the only reasonable basis for relations with the Soviet Union, but in actual fact the United States policymakers still think in terms of power politics. In a clear reference to this trend in U.S. foreign policy, the chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, Willy Brandt, said in a BBC interview that the Americans feel that they just have to be stronger than the Soviet Union. They regard this as a law of nature. All one can say about this so-called law is that it simply betrays the imperial ways of thinking of the U.S. ruling circles, who have a lot to say about an imagined Soviet military threat while simply trying to secure and edge over the Soviet Union in military matters.

There is hardly any need to say that a Soviet military threat just does not exist. One just has to accept the plain fact that the Soviet Union is a world power. In his remarks addressed to his American friends and colleagues, Willy Brandt said the West must simply accept this reality. But his advice falls on deaf ears in Washington. All it does in return is play up a Cuban pseudocrisis that paves the way to a general negative response to the Soviet peace initiatives on reducing the levels of military confrontation in central Europe.

This response reflects a general climate which now prevails in the American capital. The doves of the late 1960's and of the first half of the 1970's have faded away from the scene and are busy changing their color. And the hawks are now more prominent than ever, which is a sure sign of a righthand turn in U.S. policies. Some people now say the United States has gotten over its post-Vietnam syndrome, caused by its defeat in Southeast Asia. They say it's time again to show U.S. might and power to the world. All promises of cutbacks in military spendings are forgotten and the Pentagon practically has a free hand in getting all the funds it wants. The Senate debates on SALT II are conducted to the accompaniment of loud demands for more and better weapons, which practically boils down to a new spiral of the arms race.

So when the Soviet Union tabled its latest peace initiatives Washington responded by offering to deploy another 600 units of Eurostrategic weapons in Western Europe. This plan certainly delights the senators debating SALT II who are still trying to win military advantages for the United States and its NATO allies. So, sad as it is, there is no denying the fact that this United States response to the latest Soviet peacemoves can in no way promote peace or build up trust among the nations.

USSR PROPOSALS VITAL TO WORLD PEACE, EUROPEAN BALANCE OF POWER

LD261109 Moscow Novoye Vremya in Russian No 43, 19 Oct 79 pp 4-5 LD

[V. Kravtsov article: "The USSR's Good Will: How Will the West Respond?"--capitalized passages printed in boldface]

[Text] The conviction has spread virtually throughout the contemporary world that mankind's future depends to a considerable extent on whether it will be possible to halt the growth of weapons arsenals. Few statesmen are to be found who do not make appeals, even if simply for effect, that the arms race, which has assumed a worldwide character, be halted. But how can this be done: How can the brakes be applied to the ruthless machine which swallows up daily almost $1 billion for the production of the instruments of death? There are far fewer practical answers to such questions that there are verbal declarations. It is no exaggeration to say that the historic service rendered by socialism is that it constantly takes the initiative in the real curbing of the arms race and in the transition to practical disarmament.

An exceptionally important action has just now been taken by the Soviet country and its Warsaw Pact allies. We talking about the package of proposals which concern the weakening of military confrontation in Europe but, in terms of their significance for peace and detente, extend far beyond the confines of the European Continent. These proposals were expounded in L.I. Brezhnev's 6 October Berlin speech.

These proposals could not have been more timely, primarily, of course, because the task of limiting the arms race is, for Europe and for the world as a whole, a top-priority task for continued headway in detente. There is also the point that a very serious threat to security and cooperation in Europe has not only appeared on the horizon but also has assumed definite shape. We are talking about the plans to deploy new types of U.S. medium-range missiles fitted with nuclear warheads in Western Europe.

It may be asked, and certain information organs in the West are indeed asking naively: Is not the Soviet Union exaggerating? Is the danger of a certain "upgrading of armament" being implemented in the West and of the modernization of certain types of weapons being carried out really so great? No, the Soviet Union is not sounding the alarm for nothing. Judge for yourselves.

First of all Western Europe is already saturated and even supersaturated with weapons, including those of the most lethal kind. U.S. nuclear warheads alone number 8,000 here. There are 3,000 delivery vehicles, and no secret is made of whom they are directed against. Moreover, U.S. forward-based means even now are aimed at targets located on the territory of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. These means include submarines, aircraft carriers and other warships which sail the waters bordering on Europe, including the Mediterranean Sea. These means include phantom fighter-bombers based at European airfields. So-called tactical nuclear weapons are deployed right by the borders of the USSR's Warsaw Pact allies. Now to this they want to add those types of vehicles for U.S. nuclear weapons which could hit USSR territory from European dry land. The newspapers are writing that NATO experts, who sat behind closed doors at NATO Headquarters in Brussels, approved a project for the deployment in Western Europe of 464 cruise missiles and 108 Pershing 2 missiles (their ranges are cited as 2,400 km and 1,600 km respectively). The West European countries which may agree to have the new weapons deployed on their territory would thereby be placed in a qualitatively different strategic position from their previous one.

Secondly--and this is extremely important--the aforementioned plans are being approved under conditions where strategic parity exists between the Soviet Union and the United States. This parity is acknowledged by all serious politicians and moreover the treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms--SALT II--became possible thanks to this. The approximate balance of East and West forces in Europe is part of the total aggregate of geographical and political factors and it is impossible to examine this balance correctly if it is divorced from this complex of factors. Let us say bluntly that those people in the West who extract individual types of weapons from the complex balance which, overall, provides an approximate balance of forces, and who base all their subsequent conclusions about the allegedly persisting Soviet superiority on overemphasis of these isolated factors alone are engaging in cheating. Especially in view of the fact, as L.I. Brezhnev declared most definitely, "Over the last 10 years the number of medium-range nuclear weapon delivery vehicles on the territory of the European part of the Soviet Union has not been increased BY A SINGLE MISSILE OR A SINGLE AIRCRAFT. On the contrary the number of launchers for medium-range missiles, just like the yield of these missiles' nuclear warheads, has even DIMINISHED SOMEWHAT. The number of medium bombers has also been reduced. And the Soviet Union DOES NOT DEPLOY ANY such means on the territory of other states. For a number of years now we have not increased the numerical strength of our troops stationed in central Europe either."

So what do the NATO plans signify, if not an attempt to disrupt the balance of forces which has taken shape in Europe and to achieve military superiority?

Thirdly, apart from the military aspects there is also a very important political aspect to this matter. Against the background of the efforts for European detente and of the implementation of the accords adopted at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe--against the background, in other words, of the desire to consolidate even further the Europeans' peaceful future--efforts are being made which run in a diametrically opposite direction and which, in the final analysis, could place detente in doubt. The combination of all these circumstances is prompting the Soviet Union to speak out most vociferously about the danger which exists and to warn governments and people about it. Not just to give these warnings but to reveal, by specific initiatives, the way out of the situation that is taking shape.

Indeed, what is needed above all in order to avoid a new spiral of the arms race on the European Continent? It is necessary to reach agreement on maintaining the balance, on not taking steps which would disrupt this balance, and then on trying to reduce the level of the balance of forces and limiting and reducing arms. This is precisely what the Soviet Union is proposing. We say this: As soon as the SALT II treaty enters into force (everyone knows very well that if its ratification depended solely on the Soviet Union the question would not have arisen at all) let us immediately get down to talks on SALT III. We agree to discuss at those talks not only intercontinental arms (that is, those covered by the SALT II treaty) but also other types of weapons--that is, those on which there are no current negotiations and which include medium-range missiles. Of course, it is proposed that these questions be discussed on the basis of strict observance of the sides' equal [ravnaya] security and taking into account all relevant factors.

Strictly speaking, the West must have known about this readiness on the USSR's part earlier. It is now totally impossible any longer to pretend that this readiness does not exist. The main point is that the Soviet Union is declaring in advance, prior to the start of talks and at the most authoritative level, that it is prepared to reduce the number of medium-range nuclear weapons deployed in the western regions of the Soviet Union--but only on condition that there is no additional deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in Western Europe. [paragraph continues]

This is called a genuine display of good will.

It should be particularly emphasized that when in recent months much was being made in the West of the question of the deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles--and there was by no means an explosion of enthusiasm on this score in either the FRG or Italy, Belgium, Britain and the Netherlands--many figures were saying something like the following. We would be glad, they said, not to add the U.S. ground-based weapons to the existing arsenals, but the Soviet Union, they said, already has a terribly large number of SS-20 missiles and Backfire bombers (that is the name they use there). Now, was the Soviet Union to cut back these missiles and bombers, we might not deploy the Pershings and cruise missiles. The Soviet Union has met these wishes halfway and, moreover, on an issue which is of vital significance for the Soviet country's security.

That is not all. In response to talk of the vast number of Soviet tanks which can reach the Atlantic almost within 3 days--talk which is frightening people in the West who are not very well informed--the Soviet Union is undertaking yet another practical step: It is unilaterally withdrawing up to 20,000 servicemen, 1,000 tanks and other military equipment from GDR territory. Unilaterally: Has there been similar action by the West? This is at a time when, because of the West, the Vienna talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe have been marking time for 6 years. Reluctant to embark on specific reductions, the representatives of the NATO countries are still preferring to count every last soldier, right down to field cooks.

The initiatives launched by L.I. Brezhnev also contain proposals for the further expansion of those measures (notification of maneuvers and so forth) which lead to confidence building in the military sphere, in particular as far as reducing the probability of a surprise attack is concerned. This too is a businesslike response to the endless complaints from the West which revolve within the vicious circle of the imaginary "Soviet threat."

Understandably, the implementation of the plans for deploying the new U.S. nuclear missile weapons would entail a special risk for those countries which might agree to accept such weapons on their territory, for the socialist countries would have no choice but to take additional steps to insure their own security. At the same time the Soviet country is specially emphasizing that it will never use nuclear weapons against those states which renounce the production or acquisition of such weapons and which do not have them on their territory. In a word, the systematized Soviet proposals cover a multiplicity of spheres.

It must be said that L.I. Brezhnev's speech has made a very powerful impression not only on the Soviet Union's friends and sober-minded Western politicians but also on detente's adversaries. A certain West German journalist described the West's overall reaction as perplexity. Indeed, many propaganda arguments--about the buildup of Soviet Armed Forces, the Soviet Union's desire for military superiority and such like--have been seriously shaken. But concrete proposals permeated by good will need to be answered by deeds. At the moment it does not look, however, as if the West, taken as a whole, is prepared to do so.

This notion stems not just from the attempts being made, apparently on command, by bourgeois propaganda to belittle the scale and significance of the Soviet initiatives. The pitch has been taken from old models: "Yes, but...." The steps, they say, are positive but inadequate. Only complete unilateral disarmament by the socialist community would evidently be enough for certain figures. Of course, it is not just a matter of these ruses and attempts to evade serious discussion. The main point is that in the new and different psychological atmosphere in Europe created by the Soviet initiatives, there still persists a strong tendency to "upgrade armaments" and to insist on the intention to change the strategic situation on the European Continent in NATO's favor. [paragraph continues]

True, the following argument is appended: Let us take the decision on producing and deploying the missiles at the Atlantic Alliance session in December, the United States will begin producing them and let us then--depending on the progress of talks with the USSR--examine what we will deploy, where, and at what time.

This is dangerous camouflage for dangerous plans. When arms are being or have been produced, it is far more difficult to abandon them than now, when the USSR proposals reveal a way out of a situation which attempts are being made to depict as an impasse. Is not the way in which the issue is stated odd: Arms first and then disarm?

Fortunately, not everything these days depends on the NATO generals and politicians. The wave of feeling in Western Europe in favor of detente and disarmament is great and extensive. It is characteristic that virtually all West European governments advocate the entry into force of the SALT II treaty. Authoritative voices are ringing out in favor of not starting a new, "Eurostrategic" round of the arms race, taking advantage of the proposals made by the Soviet Union and answering its good will with good will.

Obviously, a difficult and, judging by all accounts, a lengthy struggle lies ahead in order to prevent Europe from being diverted from the path of detente, prevent the torpedoing of detente's transfer to the military sphere and prevent European soil from becoming crammed with even more missiles. It is also obvious that the positions of peace-loving forces on this question have strengthened considerably as a result of the Soviet Union's new initiatives. The whole world has seen that the Soviet Union is prepared to go a long way in questions of military detente and of ensuring peace both in and beyond Europe. The ball is in the court of the West as a whole and each individual country and each statesman is faced with crucial decisions.

ZORIN VIEWS WASHINGTON'S REACTION TO BREZHNEV PROPOSALS

LD2B0253 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

[Valentin Zorin commentary]

[Text] United Press has quoted an unnamed spokesman of the State Department as saying that the United States is consulting with the Soviet Union through diplomatic channels to clarify some aspects of the proposals President Brezhnev made during his visit to Berlin earlier this month. You will remember, President Brezhnev spoke in Berlin on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the German Democratic Republic and he made a number of entirely new constructive proposals to lessen the military confrontation in Europe and promote the relaxation of tension.

Judging by what the State Department spokesman said last Saturday, Washington fails to fully understand the Soviet Union's new initiatives. There is nothing unusual, of course, in Washington's wish to obtain additional information, though in fact the proposals couldn't have been stated more clearly. But, strangely enough, the very same spokesman in the very same statement as much as gave a negative reply to the proposals. To say accepting the proposals would be tantamount to exchanging a horse for a rabbit is indeed a misleading statement and smacks of the worst kind of propaganda.

The pronouncement of the State Department spokesman is fairly typical of the administration's reaction to the Soviet proposals, proposals which the rest of the world is giving serious consideration to. What strikes an impartial observer first of all is the inappropriate haste with which top officials in Washington reacted negatively to the Soviet initiative.

Some were quick to say no, even before they had time to really examine the proposals, say nothing of analyzing and weighing them. Undue haste, unfortunately, appears to have become the hallmark of Washington's policies. I feel sure that when the dust has [words indistinct] the administration acted like-mindedly in rushing to say no to the Soviet proposals to slow down the race in nuclear weapons. Perhaps the State Department has realized this already and hence the announcement it is consulting through diplomatic channels to clarify aspects of the proposals.

But this belated move cannot conceal that Washington's first reaction was negative. The American public is being told the Soviet Union has some ulterior motives in making the new proposals. The Soviet Union, it is said, seeks superiority in nuclear weapons in Europe. Since Americans rely on their own media for information and these are giving a biased picture of the situation, the campaign is misleading some and in fact this is just another case of deception. If there is any striving to obtain superiority, it comes from the Pentagon. Ever since SALT II was signed, making it clear limitations would be imposed on American and Soviet strategic arms, the Pentagon has been trying to move medium-range missiles closer to the Soviet Union's frontiers. Medium-range missiles are not strategic arms in the strict sense of the word but these would be given a strategic rather than tactical mission.

As for the Soviet Union, President Brezhnev has offered to reduce the number of medium-range nuclear missiles in the Western regions of the country. So, where is the striving to obtain military superiority? If the Soviet Union were after a superiority, say in Europe, it would hardly make such an offer and if, on the other hand, the Pentagon were not after superiority it would hardly be trying to get its NATO partners to accept the latest American missiles and direct them at Soviet cities.

The administration's reaction to the Soviet proposals shows that groups more interested in strength than cooperation are still influential, but experience should have made it clear that no one can get the upper hand over the Soviet Union. If goodwill is not appreciated the Soviet Union will find the means to nullify the efforts of the Pentagon and the current propaganda [words indistinct] the United States will also lose its effect. The world public is coming to see more and more clearly who is interested in a relaxation of tension and a stop to the ruinous and dangerous arms race and who puts the ambitions of the military-industrial complex before national interests.

W. EUROPEAN HARPING ON SOVIET 'MILITARY THREAT' SCORED

LD291055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 79 p 4 LD

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent R. Puchkov: "With a 'Threat' at the Ready"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Brussels, October--As soon as events contributing to the easing of international tension take place or are contemplated and as soon as the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries launch new peace initiatives the opponents of detente in the West immediately spring into action. The representatives of the military-industrial complex and the defenders of their interests in various national and supranational organs--NATO generals and their yesmen in the powerful bourgeois information media apparatus--launch a concerted attack, the mythical "Soviet threat" at the ready, in order to convince the public in the Western countries of the need to continue the arms race.

The Berlin speech by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, aroused immense interest among the broadest political and public circles in Western Europe. The precise and lucid reaffirmation of the Soviet Union's peaceful course has made a big impression here. In an attempt somehow to dilute it, to play down the significance of the Soviet Union's new peace initiatives and even to depict them as new "threats," the opponents of detente are now continuing the active propaganda campaign to prepare the public in the Western countries for a further increase in military expenditure and to secure, in advance, agreement to the decision planned for the forthcoming NATO Council December session on the deployment of hundreds of new American missiles in the countries of Western Europe. As is known, the first act in this campaign was the Brussels conference at the beginning of September: "NATO in the Next 30 years." Its participants made particularly active use of theses about the "Soviet threat," the West's imaginary military "weakness" and the need for a return to the "position of strength" policy.

A new trial balloon was sent up at the European parliamentary session at the end of September. The West German Christian Democrat Von Hassel and the British Conservative Ferguson used their right as members of the parliament and inquired of the Commission of European Communities whether it intended to "enter into talks with NATO and the competent organs of EEC member states in order to elaborate a unified arms supply program within the framework of general industrial policy." The Paris newspaper LE MONDE described this inquiry, which was discussed at the European Parliament's session, as provocative. Essentially it was another attempt to start a discussion on the implementation of the idea of organizing "European defense" which is tied up with the idea of creating a "European army" which had been rejected 25 years ago and which, naturally, could in no way contribute to the deepening of detente.

The communist deputies and representatives of a number of other parties sharply condemned both the very idea of "European defense" and the fact that the European Parliament was discussing it. "It is clear that from the very outset we must discuss the important problems facing the community," Belgian deputy Ernest Glinn, leader of the left-wing of the Socialist Party in Parliament, said: "The question is whether arms supplies and production actually rank high among the matters that require our attention." First of all, there is the crisis in a whole series of industrial sectors, he went on to say. They include--the production of steel, glass and textiles and also shipbuilding. Tens of thousands of workers who are being thrown onto the streets would like to continue in useful labor. They are asking themselves and us the question: What is going on? They believe, as do we, E. Glinn noted, that in this situation the discussion of the matter of supplies of instruments of death is a most inappropriate way of determining the importance of urgent problems.

The representatives of the center-right wing in the Parliament diligently masked their arms race propaganda with verbose speeches to the effect that the solution of a variety of West European countries' socioeconomic problems is closely associated with military expenditure. However, the reference to "industrial policy," LE MONDE noted, is nothing but an attempt to establish an alibi. Regarding as a victory the very fact that the "European defense" question was brought up in Parliament, Belgium's LE PEUPLE wrote, the majority of the European Parliament (Christian Democrats, Conservatives and Liberals) decided "to put a plus sign against the arms problem and bring it up again when necessary."

They did not have to wait long for such an opportunity. The third act in the scenario compiled by the opponents of detente was performed in Brussels from 15 through 17 October. On the initiative of the Western European Union, which is chaired by that same Von Hassel--former FRG defense minister and now a member of the European Parliament--a symposium met to discuss recommendations for a "European policy in the arms production sphere." The conference was attended by close to 350 people, mainly representatives of the Western European Union itself, NATO and the EEC. But the main participants were West European dealers who are making a fortune out of weapons production. It was therefore no accident that the hackneyed assertions about the mythical "Soviet threat" and the "need to deter the potential enemy" alternated at the Brussels session with bellicose appeals for the "launching of cooperation in the military industry." Moreover, the symposium participants tried to totally ignore the new Soviet peace initiatives set forth in L.I. Brezhnev's Berlin speech, pretending that they knew nothing of these initiatives.

In the view of the local press, the so-called NATO "Eurogroup," which includes almost all the European members of the North Atlantic bloc, is to be found lurking behind the Western European Union--the initiator of the symposium. This group was originally set up because West European military industrial concerns wanted to flex their muscles in competition with American concerns and receive more orders for arms. The stake is very high, of course. According to figures published in the paper LE CITE, during the period 1973-1977 tiny Belgium alone raised its military expenditure from 48.9 billion to 91.35 billion francs, or by 86.8 percent. Then, in accordance with the decision of the NATO Council Washington session, this expenditure increased annually by at least a further 3 percent.

The military expenditure increase in the other West European countries is on a similar gigantic scale. According to NATO's plans, the implementation over the next few years of specific programs for building up arms will require an extra $80 billion, and one-half of this will be accounted for by the West European countries.

Naturally, the arms race propagandists once again made a point of using the economic necessity "thesis" maintaining that military expenditure allegedly helps the capitalist countries to cope with crisis phenomena and to reduce unemployment.

However, more and more people in the West today are learning in fact that the militarization of the economy is destructive in social production terms since it is a nonproductive form of national income consumption. Increased taxes, higher prices for essential goods and inflation are the direct consequences of the accelerating arms race in the Western countries.

Nor does militarization contribute to increased employment. Adequate proof of this is provided by the simple fact that in recent years the massive increase in military expenditure in the West European countries has coincided with a sharp increase in unemployment. According to the pamphlet "The Right to Useful Labor," published by the Belgian Association for Monitoring and Developing Employment in connection with the reconversion of the arms industry, capital investments in the military industry create far fewer jobs in comparison with other production sectors. An investment of $1 billion contributes to the creation of 75,710 jobs in the arms industry, while the same will help to employ a further 86,114 people in machine building, 92,071 in transport, 100,072 in construction, 138,939 in the public health system and 187,299 in the sphere of people's education.

Sensing the obvious inadequacy of the economic "alibi" for the arms race, the military business is giving Western information organs lavish encouragement in developing mass propaganda aimed at casting doubts on the peace-loving course of Soviet foreign policy, resolutely reaffirmed in L.I. Brezhnev's Berlin speech, and the USSR's struggle to curb the arms race and effect disarmament. To add fuel to this provocative campaign Western politicians and military figures are making more and more statements repeatedly intimidating their countries' populations with the far-fetched "Soviet threat." At the beginning of October former Belgian National Defense Minister Vanden Boeynants, now leader of the Social Christian Party, addressed the ceremony marking the 10th anniversary of the confederation of Belgian officers' associations. He literally said the following: "I repeat once again that the constant intensification of the Warsaw Pact countries' military potential is a growing threat to the defense and security of the North Atlantic alliance. The Soviet detente policy entails a danger to NATO unity and makes our population believe that the bloc's military efforts are of no benefit to them." The minister [as published] then deplored the total inadequacy of the Western countries' military expenditure and concluded his speech by suddenly admitting that at the moment "there is little likelihood that the USSR intends to launch hostilities against NATO." We are now indeed getting used to Mr Boeynants' amazing antilogic!

At the moment NATO propaganda is stepping up its campaign in an attempt to convince public opinion of the vital need to deploy hundreds of new American missiles and nuclear warheads in West European countries, including Belgium. Moreover, many commentaries on Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's Berlin speech deliberately overlook the statement that the Soviet Union does not situate any facilities of this kind on other states' territories. Atlantic circles, the local press writes, still believe that the Soviet Union has "military superiority" [pereves] in Europe and that first it is necessary to adopt a decision on the deployment of the new American missiles in Europe and only then start talks with the USSR on reducing arms. The conservative paper, LIBRE BELGIQUE, believes that this decision will give NATO a "bargaining chip" to use at future talks.

In short, the opponents of detente are continuing to use the same old hackneyed trump card--the myth about the "Soviet threat." All ways and means are being employed: from constant mentions in the respectable information organs to hysterical screeches in the gutter press. A tour of NATO bases in Europe was organized for a group of Belgian journalists. This resulted in a series of articles assiduously interweaving the "Soviet threat" myth with the thesis that however blasphemous it may sound, following the signing of the SALT II treaty "defenseless" Western Europe needs extra arms and preferably the most modern. "In an admiral's cap (kindly loaned for a while) and s ding next to dozens of missiles you feel better," a LE SOIR correspondent playfully wrote in a report from on board an American aircraft carrier in the Mediterranean. But some journalists even had the gall to lament the fact that such a barbaric weapon as the neutron bomb was not deployed in Western Europe.

But will millions of ordinary people, inhabitants of Brussels and Amsterdam, Bonn and Rome, like the Le SOIR journalist, "feel better" in the company of hundreds of new transatlantic missiles and thousands of new combat vehicles? They certainly will not!

BRITAIN WARNED AGAINST DEPLOYMENT OF U.S. MISSILES

LD270505 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

["Glance at the British Scene" presented by Valeriy Borisov]

[Text] A highly representative European forum for disarmament and security began in Brussels today. It is being held in response to a call made by the special disarmament session of the UN General Assembly and by the World Peace Council. Undoubtedly now that the NATO leaders are pushing ahead with their plans to deploy new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe, the discussions at the forum will center on the important new Soviet initiative concerning military relaxation and disarmament outlined by Leonid Brezhnev in his speech in Berlin.

The significance of this forum as a barometer of the mood of the European public at large ought not to be underestimated. The Soviet leader's new proposals, on the one hand, caused confusion in the NATO leadership and in the West European government backing the Pentagon's schemes. On the other hand, they have given rise to disguised and undisguised attacks on the Soviet initiative with the purpose of distorting it, preventing its discussion, and deceiving the public about the real intentions of the NATO strategists. In most of the West European NATO countries, government spokesman are maneuvering and offering evasive explanations in response to public pressure for a constructive response to the Soviet proposals and for a rejection of the plans that new American missiles be deployed on their territory. Not so in Britain, where the Conservative government is candidly and unambiguously giving its backing to Washington. Witness the recent statements by the British prime minister, Margaret Thatcher, and the defense secretary, Francis Pym, in which both of them played up the myth of a Soviet threat. (?So) Francis Pym, in his speech to his constituents in Cambridgeshire, went so far as to claim that what he called a recent massive buildup of Warsaw Treaty nuclear strength made it necessary to modernize NATO tactical nuclear weaponry.

But is this really so? Leonid Brezhnev made it quite clear in Berlin that in the past 10 years the Soviet Union has not added a single plane or missile to its medium-range nuclear arsenal. What is more, the number of launchers for such missiles and the yield of their nuclear warheads have even been somewhat reduced. The real aim of the NATO strategists is not merely to modernize or upgrade their arms. It is proposed to introduce entirely new nuclear missile systems. Even now NATO is, of course, well armed. The American forward-based weaponry in Europe is a serious threat the Soviet Union cannot afford to disregard. There are about 8,000 units of nuclear weapons at roughly 100 points on the territory of America's West European NATO allies. No less than 2,000 of them could be delivered to targets on Soviet territory by Pershing 1 missiles, by the Phantom and F-111 tactical air force planes based in Britain and on aircraft carriers cruising in European waters. Nor is there anything to the British defense secretary's arguments alleging that the Warsaw Treaty has a military superiority. Even according to the London Institute of Strategic Studies, which undoubtedly has close links with NATO circles, the existing military balance between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO is not seriously threatened. What then is the fuss about?

This question was answered indirectly by the former Federal German Chancellor, Willy Brandt, in a recent BBC interview. In reference to certain quarters in the United States, he made the remark that they presume that the United States has to be stronger than the Soviet Union, and that this is some law of nature. In other words, the most reactionary imperialist forces in the United States cannot make themselves accept the fact that the Soviet Union has become a great world power and they seek to achieve a military advantage. For the sake of such a questionable and (?risky gamble) they are prepared to sacrifice their West European allies and set them up as the first victims by deploying new Pershing missiles and cruise missiles on their territory, including the British Isles. But what is more dangerous for the peoples of Western Europe? Another spiral of the arms race with its additional burdens for taxpayers, or the road of disarmament proposed by the Soviet Union? NATO rearmament leads not only to another qualitative and quantitative leap in the bloc's nuclear potential. In reply to it, the Soviet Union will have to take appropriate steps, too. This means military confrontation in Europe will be hotted up still more.

The Soviet Union threatens no one when it gives the warning that if new American nuclear missiles are nonetheless deployed in Western Europe, it will have to take countermeasures. This is a reality the Western leaders cannot disregard if they have a sense of responsibility for the future of their nations.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD281800 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Moscow Radio commentator Gennadiy Mikhaylovich Ariyevich and international affairs journalists Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Bovin and Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin]

[Text] [Ariyevich] Good day comrades. We would like to start today's broadcast by discussing an event--an event, one can say without exaggeration, that has attracted an enormous amount of attention from politicians, public figures in various countries, and the entire world public for the last 3 weeks. The important initiatives put forward in the speech made by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev in Berlin are seen throughout the world as a new manifestation of the truly titanic efforts being made by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to deepen the relaxation of tension and to curb the arms race. It is being noted everywhere that this initiative has given mankind a historic chance to stop the suicidal arms race, to step into a path of real disarmament and to supplement political detente with military detente. Nikolay Vladimirovich, I would like you to dwell on these initiatives and the reactions to them throughout the world in more detail.

Brezhnev's Initiatives, Reactions

[Shishlin] Well, there is hardly any need to talk about the initiatives themselves. The details of these initiatives are well known, and as far as the reactions are concerned, they have crystallized to some extent. If one speaks of governmental circles--to whom the initiatives of the Soviet Union are addressed to a significant degree--then one can, perhaps, call their reaction a mixture of suspicion and interest.

[Bovin--chuckling] I would say that there was more suspicion from America and more interest from Western Europe. That is the distribution of these two factors.

[Shishlin] Quite right. Moreover, there is some disorder with regard to the specific initiatives and attitudes about them. Well, naturally, governmental circles in the United States and Western Europe are giving a positive assessment to the decision of the Soviet Union to withdraw 20,000 military personnel from the GDR as well as 1,000 tanks and other military equipment, although there is a lot of talk as to just what kind of forces are involved--will they be specific units or individual soldiers and officers?

[Bovin--interrupting] What kind of tanks? Old or new?

[Shishlin] Yes, and...

[Bovin] Where they will be withdrawn to.

[Shishlin] Yes, and it would appear that the recent article by Dmitriy Fedorovich Ustinov, USSR minister of defense and a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, has answered these questions as well. The withdrawal will involve a large formation.

Western reaction to the Soviet proposals on the extension in Europe of measures of trust can also indisputably be described as positive. But one does get the impression that they want to delay a businesslike discussion of these ideas and examine these proposals only during the Madrid meeting of representatives of states taking part in the all-European conference in Helsinki.

There is a more complex reaction to the Soviet proposals concerning SALT III talks, or, more precisely, talks on lowering the threshold of military confrontation in Europe and curbing the arms race on the continent, including nuclear missiles. Here, of course, quite a complicated game is getting under way in the West. Essentially, the situation is being presented--they are trying to present the situation in the following way: that the Soviet Union and the United States, having signed the SALT II treaty, have thereby somehow put their relations in order in a sphere as sensitive as arms production and the correlation of military forces. Where does Europe stand as a result of all this? On its own, it seems, faced by Soviet SS-20 missiles and a plane which is called Backfire in the West. Well, one must say frankly that this formulation of the problem is exceptionally false.

[Ariyevich] The Soviet initiative has also served as a powerful stimulus in activating the West European public against the plans of the Pentagon and NATO to deploy new American nuclear missile systems on the continent. What kind of systems are these and why is it thought that they could change the strategic situation on the continent?

[Shishlin] The same 572 American missiles--that is, the Pershing-II and cruise missiles--are American-made missiles which will remain in the hands of the Americans and which the Americans will have at their disposal. Essentially, the Europeans are providing nothing but territory. The United States, which already has forward-based weapons there in the so-called military threat of action, is now acquiring new strategic weapons with which it hopes to break down the present military strategic situation in Europe and create for itself the opportunity of talking with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries from a position of strength. This is why it is not a question of some double umbrella, or, more precisely, of some new European missile...

[Bovin--interrupting] A Euroumbrella...

[Shishlin- A Euroumbrella, but a matter of the same American umbrella, which covers not so much the Europeans as the Americans themselves, and serves precisely the political interests of the United States itself. Thus, on this point it is purely a matter of cheating the public. It is pure trickery, concealing very long-range political and strategic calculation.

[Ariyevich] I think it would be interesting to stress that in planning to deploy new nuclear weapons in Europe, the leaders of the United States, and those leaders in Western Europe who support their plan, are hushing up the fact that if the weapons so deployed were to be put into operation, retaliatory action would follow against the corresponding West European countries as well. In this way, the implementation of these plans would increase the danger for Western Europe, something which could be totally avoided, since the Soviet Union, as Leonid Ilich Brezhnev stressed once again, will never use nuclear weapons against those states who refuse to produce and acquire such weapons and who do not have them on their territory.

Modernization of NATO Weaponry

[Bovin] I would like to add a few thoughts. Well now, in Europe, particularly in continental Europe, the idea of the so-called modernization of NATO's weaponry is being very closely linked with SALT II. This represents an attempt to balance in some way the negative influence this idea has on the public. They try to put it this way: Yes, we will accept the decision on modernization, but at the same time you must offer to the Soviet Union to start talks within the framework of SALT III but, naturally, there will be no SALT III if there is no SALT II.

Western Europe is now actively pressing the American administration and the Senate to insure that the SALT II treaty will be ratified.

Well, generally speaking, the U.S. administration is making use of this pressure and is actively telling the Senate: You can see the reaction in Europe, let us get on with it. In fact, just last week Senator Nunn spoke at the Institute for Foreign Political Analysis in New York, where he said the following: A refusal by the governments of West European countries to support the Carter government's plan to deploy medium-range missiles there could lead Washington to adopt a decision to withdraw all American nuclear weapons from the Continent. He goes on: Attempts by the U.S. Government and the leaders of the allied governments to link approval of the SALT II treaty with the decision to deploy new missiles could shake the very foundations of the NATO alliance.

These statements evoked a sharp reaction in Europe, and primarily in the FRG, to whom all this most directly refers. The FRG newspaper STUTTGARTER ZEITUNG, for example, responded to Nunn's speech in the following way: There has never before been a responsible U.S. politician who has come out with such serious threats. In Bonn, and elsewhere in Western Europe, the suspicion that the United States is using big brother methods and that it is trying once more to impose political decisions on its allies will grow.

Nunn, sensing that he had overdone something, started apologizing and even published a denial to the effect that he did not mean all nuclear weapons, but only obsolete nuclear weapons. And reaction has once again followed this denial. Here are, for example, some typical words from the same FRG newspaper: American military strategists are behaving, in matters of European politics, just like a bull in a china shop.

The series of warnings and threats directed at the Europeans in Nunn's statements will in no way make it easier for them to accept the unpleasant and controversial decision regarding the deployment of new missiles. This is all the more true since far more friendly voices and realistic proposals are being heard from the Eastern side. Thus there is, so to speak, on this so-called modernization issue, the development of quite a complicated game between Western Europe and the United States, because realistically minded Europeans understand that the United States is pursuing its own interests above all. They are putting pressure on Western Europe.

It is difficult to say how the matter will end. The NATO nuclear planning group is to hold a session in The Hague in November. Something will probably be clarified there...

[Shishlin--interrupting] Yes, it seems that a decision will be adopted there on the production of missiles, but not on deployment...

[Bovin--interrupting] No, no, no, no. At the moment, everything generally points to perhaps the adoption of a simultaneous decision on production and deployment...

[Ariyevich--interrupting] Well, here I think it is important to stress that the Soviet initiative is a new confirmation of the coordinated actions taken by the states of the socialist community. This is the guarantee of success for our peaceful foreign policy.

Moreover, the movement against turning Western Europe into a launching pad for American nuclear missiles is growing day by day. The extent of this movement can be seen in the Week of Action for Disarmament held during the last few days. It focused on the decision of a special session of the UN General Assembly and the World Peace Council. It began on 24 October with demonstrations in the FRG, Belgium, Holland, Britain, the United States and other countries. The demonstrators demanded from the governments and parliaments of their countries a constructive and positve answer to the Soviet initiative. Our country sees this popular movement for peace and security as an important ally for its foreign policy and an important element in the ultimate success of the world-wide struggle against violence, aggression and wars.

Soviet, Middle Eastern Initiatives

The Soviet-Syrian communique signed in Moscow likewise emphasizes the importance of extending international detente to all parts of the world. The points of this political document map out realistic ways to ease tension in one of the most explosive regions of the world, the Near East. That position was further confirmed in the course of the Soviet-South Yemeni talks, though, at the same time, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and 'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il condemned the increasing attempts of the imperialist forces to create hotbeds of tension in the Red Sea and Persian Gulf by knocking together new blocs for interference in the internal affairs of the countries of that region.

[Bovin] Yes. Here, of course, what is basically at issue is the need to extend the process of detente that has, on the whole, begun to develop most rapidly in Europe to all parts of the world. The first thing that needs to be done, if this is to be achieved, is to extinguish and resolve certain conflicts that are the most inflamed. Among these, above all, is the Near East. Hence the importance of the visit to Moscow of our Syrian and Yemeni friends.

[Shishlin] Yes, and those visits have been very successful. The way in which the results of Al-Asad's visit to Moscow are being assessed by Syrian political circles indicates rather eloquently that, in the very complex and motley picture of the Near East, relations between the Soviet Union and the resistance front of the Arab states are actually an element that strengthens the just cause of the Arabs.

[Bovin] It works for a genuine solution to the Near East conflict, and not for those less than half-measures--those quarter-measures--offered for instance by Camp David and the subsequent agreements.

[Shishlin] Just a few words about the friendship and cooperation treaty concluded between the Soviet Union and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. I think this treaty will also be one of the physicians, as it were, of the stability of the Arab cause, a just cause which, in one way or another, indisputably obscures the horizons of peaceful policy, not only in that region, but casts a shadow over international relations as a whole. [sentence as heard] And so, in speaking of those visits, I think we can say that in international politics there is no such thing as a dead end situation. There are temporary deadlocks--deadlocks occur temporarily. But when such elements get moving, when ties grow between the Arab states and the forces supporting them--among which, certainly, are the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist comity--these are exactly those political factors that can have a long-term influence on that situation--an influence in the right direction. That is the direction of peace and the restoration of tranquillity in the region while firmly safeguarding the security of all the states and countries there.

[Ariyevich] In this connection I would like to quote the Lebanese paper ASH-SHARQ, which wrote, with regard to Comrade Brezhnev's speech at the dinner in Moscow in honor of 'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il: The Soviet leader confirmed that Israel can be assured of its security only within the borders of 1967. The Soviet Union firmly advocates the liberation of all Arab lands conquered since then and implementation of the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to create their own independent state. The leader of the Soviet Union--another Lebanese newspaper, AL-NIDA wrote--warned the Tel Aviv leaders and their protectors that the time has come for them to heed the voice of reason.

[Bovin] It is very interesting in this connection--you probably all know, comrades, that the Israeli foreign minister, Moshe Dayan, has resigned. It is a very interesting event. What really separates Dayan from Begin? Dayan, like Begin, is against the formation of a Palestinian state. Here, on this central principle, there is no difference between Dayan and Begin. But there is another difference. From Dayan's point of view, Begin is acting too grossly, too straightforwardly, thereby increasing Israel's isolation and increasing the number of the Israeli Government's critics.

In this connection, Dayan proposed--from his point of view--a more flexible method of dealing with the Palestinians. In particular, he proposed, for instance, starting more active negotiations with the Palestinians living on the West Bank. He suggested that private Arab lands there not be used for settlements. He proposed the withdrawal, if need be, of the Israeli military administration from the West Bank--and so on. That is...

[Shishlin--interruption] In general, retaining the right to bring it back immediately.

[Bovin] Certainly. Dayan's idea was to increase the smokescreen that would conceal from world public opinion the actual continuation of Israel's domination in those regions. Well, little by little these contradictions accumulated. They recently became more intense, and Dayan resigned. This, from every point of view, has weakened Begin's position. It has created rather considerable difficulties within Israel itself, and, in general, has given food for thought to many people in Israel. It must be said that the line Begin is pursuing is increasingly beginning to evoke--well, resistance is perhaps as yet too strong a word, but at least questions and doubts. Doubts, because it is becoming clear to nearly everyone that this line is leading to a stalemate in the Palestine problem.

[Shishlin] Of course, though our listeners undoubtedly understand full well that on the Israeli political scene in general, the tone is set by birds of such a predatory tendency.

[Bovin] Dayan has always been one of their number and still is.

[Shishlin] Yes, and Dayan can in no sense be called a peacemaker.

[Bovin] That makes his resignation all the more interesting.

[Ariyevich] Yes. In a word, the divergences between Dayan and Begin are purely tactical. All the same, Dayan's resignation has laid bare a deep internal political crisis in Israel, an instability of the ruling top brass in Tel Aviv, has it not?

[Shishlin] Aleksandr Yevgenlyevich has been in Israel himself, as it happens, and so he has seen with his own eyes how the situation looks.

[Bovin] It all looks very complicated, but the interesting point is that I talked with various people there, with those whom you might call the bourgeois liberal intelligentsia. I talked with the professors at the universities. Among these people these misgivings about Begin's tough line are pretty clearly defin They say: We do not like this policy. But what the alternative may be is not yet clear, because the creation of a Palestinian state--which is absolutely necessary in an objective sense--still arouses in them all sorts of doubts and apprehensions. Well, of course all this goes back to a long-standing enmity. It is all understandable. But there must be a psychological breakthrough at some point, because nothing can be solved without the creation of a Palestinian state.

[Shishlin] This is all the more true since the Camp David deal, which, although it is being implemented, is revealing itself as not even a half-measure, but some sort of quarter-measure.

[Bovin] It is being put into practice only so far as Israel's gradual withdrawal from the Sinai is concerned, which was what As-Sadat wanted. But on the main problem, Palestine, there is a complete deadlock, and 6 months of negotiation have come to nothing.

[Ariyevich] All the same it can be said that the situation in the Near East is beginning to change somewhat. In any case, there is the fact that, on the one hand, U.S. efforts to push through the separate Camp David deal are being stepped up, while, on the other, the Arab countries are becoming more active.

[Bovin] I think it is beginning to change in a slightly different sense. The more obvious the deadlock at the talks on so-called autonomy for Palestine becomes, the more one is beginning to see the need to seek some other forum at which to discuss all these problems. In this sense, it is very interesting, too, that the Americans have sensed that it is impossible to solve the problem without the Palestinians. Now they are trying to approach it from the flank, as it were, by working on the PLO and seeking out some elements there who might agree to some sort of compromise, maybe a feeble and rotten one, but still a compromise. On the other hand, the Arab states are intensifying their pressure.

[Ariyevich] Tel Aviv is showing clear signs of hegemonism in its striving to dictate its terms to other countries, the inadmissability of which our country has raised as an issue at the United Nations. Unfortunately, there are more than a few examples of hegemonism. Similar strivings are also being manifested by the Chinese leaders. This is reflected to the full in the trip of Hua Guofeng, premier of the PRC State Council, to a number of countries in Western Europe.

Hua's West European Visit

[Bovin] The visit of the Chinese premier has given rise to a very great deal of varied chatter. Indeed, an interesting point is that in the 1960's the Chinese worked very actively in Europe in that they were setting up these Maoist, ultra-leftist groups of theirs and were calling for the overthrow of all European capitalist governments. Later, all of this ended and dried up. These groups, for all intents and purposes, disintegrated. All things considered, the Chinese did not manage to get into Europe from the left. Then very quickly they changed course and were attempting to get into Europe from the right. That is, they began to build contacts and bridges with the most conservative representatives in Europe. Hua is now proceeding through governments, and Hua's visit has shown precisely that they attach a great deal of importance to Europe in their global policy.

But the aims of the Chinese in this connection are very clear. They are attempting to drive a wedge between Western Europe and the Soviet Union. That is their strategic purpose. It may be expressed in different ways in different countries, but the sense is the same. The Chinese are constantly telling Western Europeans that the Soviet Union is a threat to Europe and therefore it is necessary to intensify military-political integration and to strengthen NATO in order to counter this threat. Of course, they say it is necessary for Europe to intensify its contacts with China. Well, out of diplomatic considerations Hua Guofeng did not speak as openly as this in Paris and Bonn. But, particularly in Paris, he had quite a lot to say about this notorious hegemonism and everyone understood what he was referring to.

[Ariyevich] Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, it is no secret in general that there exist in Western European countries certain circles who are striving to do nicely for themselves by procuring Chinese military orders. These circles are, to a certain extent, responding to Hua's appeals. However, in general, according to reports in the press, one gets the impression that on the whole the attempts by Hua Guofeng to use the visit to Western Europe--and this was particularly to be seen in Paris--to propagate the anti-Soviet and militarist views of the Beijing leadership and to organize a campaign of Western European reaction against the USSR is receiving a fairly cool reception in his host countries.

[Bovin] Yes, that is certainly the case. In this respect, for example, the Italian paper IL POPOLO wrote a few days ago that if the Chinese premier has come with the thought of finding an anti-Soviet Europe or thought that he could direct it along such a course, then the first stage of his trip--meaning France--undoubtedly disappointed him. Well, this is how it was in actual fact, because Europeans are aware of the need for detente and for contacts with the Soviet Union. It seems to me that the only country where the ideas propounded by Hua Guofeng may meet with any more-or-less positive response is Britain.

[Shishlin] Indeed, in this respect I feel more pessimism than you, inasmuch as there was still the political baggage which Hua Guofeng brought with him. It is fairly substantial and specific. Well, let us take an issue such as, say the attitude of contemporary China to the proposals that were put forward by the Soviet Union in agreement with the other Warsaw Treaty countries with regard to the very sensitive field of the limitation and curtailment of the arms race. China is attempting, in the most energetic fashion, to convince Europe that it should, without hesitation, accept American nuclear missiles and intensify military preparations. It is calling for the creation of some sort of strong Europe--a Europe which is strong in military terms and which is confronting the Soviet Union.

Let us take a second issue--the attitude of the Chinese leadership to the policy of detente. They believe the policy of detente to be a mockery. They say that under the cover of detente the Soviet Union is expanding its influence in all areas of the world and is forcing the capitalist West, including the United States, to give up one position after another.

Finally, there is the element in Hua Guofeng's baggage which was dragged out into the light of day in West Germany. This is the thesis of the Chinese leadership that they are entirely in favor of the so-called reunification of Germany. If one looks closely at what is generally behind this thesis, it is just another approach to the same thing: the breakdown of the present military-political situation in Europe and a sharp deterioration and a destabilization of the situation so as to put additional pressure on the socialist countries and on the Soviet Union.

[Bovin] That is correct, but I would like to stress another point. This baggage, with regard to detente, that Hua brought to Europe has not in general produced much enthusiasm either in Paris or in Bonn. Although in some respects they would not be against using this Chinese card very carefully and neatly, on the whole it seems to me that for them the policy of detente and relations with the Soviet Union are altogether issues of greater significance at the present time than the baggage of Hua Guofeng.

[Ariyevich] This is because they cannot fail to realize that this baggage is fraught with danger for themselves.

[Bovin] Of course, the visit by Hua Guofeng impresses Western European politicians in view of the role that China plays and will continue to play in the world arena. But I am still inclined, somehow, to give a little more credence to the political realism of Hua Guofeng's West European partners and for some reason it seems to me that although the overtures that Hua Guofeng is making may be somewhat praised, and although the political character of Schmidt and Giscard d'Estaing will lead them to listen to anything most courteously, nevertheless the main line of their countries is toward detente. It seems that Hua Guofeng will be unable to shake the continuity of detente in Europe.

[Shishlin] That is so. The line itself will not be overturned, but we realize very well that this situation generally adds to the elements of confrontation in the contemporary world.

[Bovin] Certainly, it adds to them, but, incidentally, this will perhaps be revealed rather more accurately in Britain, because it is there that Hua Guofeng will have more attentive audience and his baggage will be more liked than it was, say, by the representatives of Bonn or Paris. It seems that unlike Paris, Bonn and Italy, there will certainly be in Britain--it has even been thought possible that there may be some deal with regard to, say, Harriers--I remember that this is thought possible. At least things were moving that way.

But on the whole, this attempt by the Chinese to destabilize the situation in Western Europe--it seems to me will not succeed. But certain new nuances may arise.

[Ariyevich] In short, the opponents of detente and peaceful cooperation between states are presently becoming more active, both in the East and in the West. But, after all, even their increased activity is proof of the successes achieved by the coordinated peace offensive of the socialist countries. This success increasingly provides grounds for optimism and for hopes that we will eventually succeed in making the process of detente irreversible.

Here we come to the end of our program and take our leave of you. Thank you for your attention. All the best.

ISLAMIC NEWS AGENCIES CONFERENCE ENDS

LD281608 Moscow TASS in English 1502 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Istanbul, October 28, TASS--The First Conference of News Agencies of Islamic Countries ended here. The communique adopted by the conference expresses a resolute support for the just struggle of the Arabs for complete liberation of all Israeli-occupied lands, for ensuring the lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including its right to form its own independent state. The conference passed a decision to widen cooperation among Islamic countries in the information sphere.

TASS: U.S. PURSUING 'BIG STICK' POLICY IN CARIBBEAN

LD252112 Moscow TASS in English 1936 GMT 25 Oct 79 LD

["Free Expression of Will U.S. Style"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, October 25, TASS--TASS news analyst Nikolay Chigir writes:

An antigovernment conspiracy has been uncovered and prevented by Panama's security service. Among the arrested plotters are two citizens of the USA.

The U.S. administration, as the Washington POST reports, is examining the question of economic sanctions against Jamaica. Washington could not invent anything as a pretext for this hostile move apart from the hackneyed charges of adherence to communism of the government of that independent country. In the lingo of American propaganda this means, as the newspaper quite frankly declares, that the Government of Jamaica "dares" to come out from positions independent from Washington and even criticise the USA.

A hostile campaign against the Government of Grenada is increasing on Washington's instructions. This provocative campaign, as the Guyana CHRONICLE points out, started after the recent tour of a number of Caribbean countries by representative of the U.S. State Department Philip Habib and became particularly frenzied after Grenada reaffirmed its anti-imperialist positions at the Havana nonaligned summit conference.

These and many other similar facts are in crying conflict with the verbal declarations by the official circles of Washington, including the statement by U.S. Secretary of State Vance in La Paz, that the USA is concerned with the defence of freedom and free expression of will by the Latin American and Caribbean states. Words are words, but the practical deeds of the USA irrefutably testify that as before Washington continues pursuing in its relations with the countries of the Western hemisphere a course of pressure and blackmail, of impudent interference in their home affairs.

But in fact, little has changed in the U.S. policy since it engineered armed and other interventions against Nicaragua and Guatemala, Cuba and the Dominican Republic. And today U.S. diplomacy pursures the same 'big stick' policy, the strategy and tactics of gunboats, the only difference being, perhaps that gunboats have been now replaced with powerful aircraft carriers, helicopters carriers and other latest kinds of military equipment and weapons.

A graphic expression of this is also the current show of U.S. military might in the Caribbean accompanied with the provocative landing of a big force of the Marines in Guantanamo Base situated in Cuba's territory contrary to the will of the whole Cuban people.

One may ask why does Washington need this sabre rattling in the Caribbean, as here nobody and nothing threatens, nor can threaten the security of such a powerful state as the USA. Reports coming from the Caribbean and Central American countries leave no doubt that the deployment of the U.S. Naval and Airforce in the Caribbean pursues the definite aim of blackmailing the countries and peoples of that area, of creating a military basis for U.S. interference in the affairs of the states, whose policy runs counter to the hegemonic ambitions of the U.S. ruling circles.

It is absolutely obvious that the course of this kind is fraught with serious complications in the Caribbean, will bring no laurels to the present Washington administration. No propaganda subterfuges can conceal the colonialist essence of this dangerous course.

U.S. Naval Actions Scored

LD261259 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 79 p 5 LD

[TASS Roundup: "Pentagon Maneuvers"]

[Text] Washington, 18 October--The Pentagon has announced that a U.S. Navy task force comprising seven warships has entered the Indian Ocean. The squadron's flagship is the attack aircraft carrier Midway, with 60 warplanes on board.

As representatives of U.S. naval command stated, the task force, which includes cruisers and destroyers, will carry out exercises and call at ports in a number of countries on the shores of the Indian Ocean. It is supposed that the squadron will enter, in particular, the Arabian Sea and the Gulf of Aden.

It is noted here that the American squadron has been sent to the Indian Ocean in accordance with President J. Carter's recent decision to strengthen the U.S. naval presence in the Indian Ocean.

At the same time the United States is rapidly extending the naval and air force base on Diego Garcia Island--the main strongpoint of the American naval and air forces operating in the Indian Ocean area.

Washington is building up its military presence in the Indian Ocean against the will of the peoples of the littoral states and all peace-loving peoples. It was the fault of the United States that Soviet-American talks on limiting and subsequently reducing military activity in the Indian Ocean were broken off.

Delhi, 18 October--The Communist Party of India has appealed to all the country's democratic and patriotic forces and to the government to take a firm stand against the U.S. fueling of military tension in the Indian Ocean.

The public in Latin American countries condemns Washington's escalation of the American military presence in the Caribbean, which is accompanied by threats aimed at freedom-loving Cuba and other countries in the region. The provocative landing of 2,200 American marines at the Guantanamo military base was a clear "show of American might."

Havana--In sending a new contingent of servicemen to the Guantanamo Naval Base the United States is not only trying to intimidate Cuba but is virtually acting against the nonalined movement, the PRENSA LATINA agency says in a commetary. Beyond any doubt the landing of American troops at the military enclave in the Caribbean is contrary to the nonalined movement's condemnation of the U.S. blockade of Cuba and the demand to return the Guantanamo base to the Cuban people, PRENSA LATINA stresses.

New York--As a UPI correspondent reports from Guantanamo, Rear Adm T. Replogle, chief of staff of the recently formed Caribbean task force, who personally inspected the landing of American troops, stated that "this is only the first maneuver and I am sure it will be followed by many others."

Buenos Aires--The Communist Party of Argentina, in a statement, has sharply condemned "dangerous U.S. military provocations, whose obvious purpose is to destablize the situation in the world, prevent the success of the struggle against the arms race and hinder the Latin American peoples who are fighting for national and social liberation."

Bogota--The Colombian journal ALTERNATIVA has expressed concern felt by the country's public at Washington's attempts to cause an artificial crisis in the Caribbean. In stepping up its military presence in the region, the Colombian journal stresses, Washington is trying in vain to restrain the political hurricane which has recently been shaking the foundations of American imperialism in the Caribbean and Central America. Antananarivo--Provocative U.S. actions in the Indian Ocean and the Caribbean, the MALAGASY NEWS AGENCY stresses, are nothing but a return to gunboat diplomacy. These actions have been taken at a time when socialist community countries have put forward important new and concrete initiatives in the disarmament sphere. They clearly indicate who is creating the real threat to peace and security for the planet's peoples.

The TARATRA AGENCY exposes U.S. hypocrisy on the Indian Ocean question. On the one hand U.S. spokesman R. Moose says that the United States allegedly "has no interest in demonstrating its military presence" in the Indian Ocean, and on the other Defense Secretary H. Brown sends a navy task force there to the accompaniment of routine arguments about a "Soviet military threat."

PRAVDA CITES CONGRESSMAN'S CRITICISM OF ARMS FOR MOROCCO

LD261429 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 79 p 5 LD

[Correspondent N. Kurdyumov dispatch: "Weapons for Morocco"]

[Text] Washington, 23 October--The U.S. administration announced yesterday its decision to satisfy a request from King Hassan II of Morocco concerning the sale of arms, including reconnaissance aircraft, helicopters, antitank missiles and armored personnel carriers. Morocco is waging a war against forces of the Polisario Front which are struggling for independence and for creation of an independent Arab state in Western Sahara.

Although Washington's official spokesmen declared that the decision on weapons sales does not imply recognition of Morocco's claims to Western Sahara, Washington's step has been interpreted as evidence of a serious change in U.S. policy among the congressional circles who will have to approve this deal. Congressman S. Solarz, who holds the post of chairman of the House Subcommittee on Africa, criticizing the administration's decision, warned that the sale of weapons to Morocco would lead to U.S. involvement in the conflict and to a dragging out of the war. Friendship with Morocco, he declared, places no obligation on the United States to support an unjust cause and he observed that the decision to sell weapons will alienate from the United States "many other countries which believe that the people of Western Sahara must be given the right to decide their future themselves."

TASS REPORTS VANCE STATEMENT ON INSURING U.S. SECURITY

LD271508 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Washington, October 27, TASS--U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance spoke in Gainsville, Florida, on the question of ensuring the security of the United States.

He again resorted to standard-type assertions as to a build-up of Soviet military might, imputing to the USSR non-existent aggressive aspirations. Thereby the secretary of state apparently tried to justify the quite real, not mythical, build-up of armaments and increase in military spending practised by the USA and its partners for NATO.

At the same time Cyrus Vance had to admit that the USA and its allies spend for military purposes approximately 25 per cent more money than the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty countries.

PENTAGON REQUEST FOR INCREASED MILITARY SPENDING NOTED

LD271106 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1920 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Washington, 26 Oct (TASS)--The Pentagon is demanding a considerable increase in military spending in the 1981 fiscal year. The FY-81 budget is now being completed.

According to a UPI report, the administration is examining the question of raising military appropriations by up to $16 billion over earlier planned figures. For its part, the New York TIMES believes that the growth in military spending will reach $20 billion.

According to preliminary estimates, the Pentagon's total budget for FY-81 will be between $151 and $162 billion. Originally, military spending for that period had been planned at $145.7 billion, already an all-time record for the United States. In its intention to spend astronomical amounts for military ends the administration is being led by the military-industrial complex and its lobbyists in Congress, who are now trying to get a 5-percent annual increase in "real" military spending (that is, spending with an allowance for inflation).

A considerable part of the additional military spending will be related to establishment of the so-called "fast reaction corps" of 110,000 men, which is meant to play the role of U.S. imperialism's strike force. There are also plans to increase considerably the sums allocated for deployment of the latest strategic systems, in particular the "MX" missiles.

House Approval of Arms Bill

LD271122 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0710 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Washington, 27 Oct (TASS)--The House of Representatives on Friday approved the bill on allocations for arms purchases and development of new weapons systems for 1980, with the colossal sum of $41.4 billion. Two days ago this bill was approved by the Senate and it will now go to the President for signing. The bill provides $27.8 billion for the purchase of new armaments. Out of this $6.7 billion is assigned for the building of 14 new warships, including a nuclear power aircraft carrier which alone will cost $2.1 billion, two atomic attack submarines and a Trident missile-carrying submarine. Some $13.6 billion will be spent on buying 705 aircraft, and $5.1 billion will go for new missiles. And $13.6 billion is allocated for military research and work for creating new and even more lethal weapons systems.

The arms races is being pressed by the dealers in death--the concerns which produce weapons. Thus, the U.S. Navy today announced that it had placed with the Lockheed company an order for 82 Trident-1 missiles at a total cost of $524 million.

PRC DEFENSE MINISTER'S PLANS ON MODERNIZATION CRITICIZED

OW2301054 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0730 GMT 25 Oct 79 OW

[Text] Dear Listeners: The 10th issue of this year's HONGQI carried an article by Chinese Defense Minister Xu Xianqian calling for a firm struggle in order to realize the modernization of national defense. According to Xu Xianqian, the "modernization of national defense is an urgent requirement in counterattacking social-imperialism." Our station observer Lavrov has the following comments on this subject:

When the Beijing leaders talk about "social-imperialism," they mean the Soviet Union. However, our nation has never threatened China, let alone committed aggression against it, and the Chinese minister of National Defense knows this. He also naturally knows that in the 1950's the Soviet Union and its armed forces made tremendous contributions to the modernization of China's national defense and to arming the PLA. Even today, the 100 enterprises for national defense originally built by the Soviet Union are still the foundation of China's military industry. With these facts in mind, would China's armymen believe in Xu Xianqian's allegation that the Soviet Union will possibly invade China? Let us ask another question: Why should we help arm another nation in disregard of our own difficulties, and then later attack it as claimed by Beijing's propaganda machinery? Xu Xianqian indicated that China had a certain purpose in strengthening its own national defense in the first 10 years after the founding of the People's Republic of China, and that it had a totally different purpose in expanding its military strength during the 20 years thereafter.

During the first 10 years following the founding of the nation, the Chinese People's Liberation Army, together with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, safeguarded the revolutionary fruits of their own country as well as the socialist community and the people of other countries. During that period, the more powerful the PLA was, the more confident China's workers were in building socialism and laying a solid socialist foundation. During the 1960's and 1930's the modernization of China's national defense served another purpose. During that period, the Beijing leaders turned the Chinese Army into an international force of aggression and a tool to exert pressure on its neighboring countries and blackmail other nations. Its aggression against socialist Vietnam between February and March this year is a typical example.

Commenting on China's aggression against Vietnam, the U.S. newspaper WALL STREET JOURNAL wrote: Although China itself withdrew from this battle of aggression, it lost all its prestige and was mauled black and blue. China's so-called modernization of national defense was long ago replaced by the militarization of China's political, economic and social life and by efforts to strengthen war preparedness in order to fulfill the Beijing leaders' plans, particularly those to plunder Asia. No wonder the Beijing leaders are willing to use half the state budget in military expenditures. We would like you to make a comparison: in the late 1950's only 19 percent of the state budget was used to strengthen national defense.

There is another fact that will show that China's present war preparations are not defensive in nature. There are more than 5,000 types of weapons on the military shopping lists in the pockets of Beijing's envoys. They have traveled all over the world looking for foreign technology and armaments, and many of the weapons on the shopping lists are not defensive in nature--they are for offensive use. If this is true, then how can one believe Xu Xianqian's words in HONGQI that China's modernization of national defense accords with the interests of all peace-loving countries and people?

NORTHEAST ASIA

REPORTAGE ON ASSASSINATION OF SOUTH KOREAN PRESIDENT

Death of Pak Chong-hui

OW271552 Moscow in Korean to Korea 0930 GMT 27 Oct 79 OW

[Text] South Korean dictator Pak Chong-hui has been shot dead in a gunfight. Premier Choe Kyu-ha is reported to have assumed presidential powers and martial law has been proclaimed in the country. Immediately after the proclamation of martial law, it was announced that the U.S. forces in South Korea had been placed in combat-readiness. In recent days the people of South Korea have made forceful advances against the Pak Chong-hui dictatorial regime, which is supported by Washington.

Declaration of Martial Law

OW271556 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1330 GMT 27 Oct 79 OW

[Text] Martial law was proclaimed in South Korea after dictator Pak Chong-hui was killed on Friday, 26 October. Kim Chae-kyu, chief of the Central Intelligence Agency of the Seoul government, killed Pak and several of his bodyguards in a gunfight.

In recent days, mass demonstrations were held in Seoul, Pusan, Masan and other South Korean cities against the antipopular regime. The demonstrators were demanding that the regime release political prisoners and respect human rights. Sixty-nine members of the National Assembly resigned their seats under slogans protesting the tyranny of the regime. Following Pak's death, Premier Choe Kyu-ha became acting president.

U.S. Troops on Alert

LD270938 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

[Text] The South Korean dictator Pak Chong-hui has been killed during a fire exchange at the presidential palace. The power is now in the hands of Premier Choe Kyu-ha. The American troops in the country are on the alert following the imposing of the state of seige. In the past few days, South Korea has been a scene of powerful public action against the dictatorial regime of Pak Chong-hui supported by Washington.

Distrust of Seoul Explanation

LD282128 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] The new authorities in Seoul are reportedly trying to conceal the motives of the assassination of dictator Pak Chong-hui. At a meeting investigating the assassination has admitted it was a premeditated act. [sentence as heard] It said the chief of the South Korean Central Intelligence Agency, Kim Chae-kyu shot and killed the dictator out of fear to lose his post. Such a naive explanation has met with skepticism across the world. In the United States the New York DAILY NEWS says the assassination was simply a plot to clear the way for a more flexible government. In Hong Kong the NEW EVENING POST says the developments were orchestrated by the United States. Secret services in the United States time and again conspired against their puppets after those puppets had completely compromised themselves. The American secret services eliminated dictator Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, the head of the Saigon regime, Ngo Dinh Diem, and they twice attempted on the life of the late Haiti butcher, Duvalier senior.

U.S. Reaction, 'Involvement'

LD291000 Moscow World Service in English 0900 GMT 29 Oct 79 LD

[Text] There is tension in South Korea where dictator Pak Chong-hui was shot dead last week. The 30,000 American troops in that country have been alerted. The flagship of the American 7th Fleet, Blue Ridge and the aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk are on their way to the shores of South Korea. The American Defense Secretary Harold Brown has said the United States is not planning the withdrawal of its troops from South Korea.

Meanwhile, newspapers in many countries express the view that American special services were involved in the events in Seoul. Observers point out that the recent big demonstrations against the dictator's regime caused concern in Washington and made it take steps to replace Pak Chong-hui with another puppet.

U.S. Decision to Remove Pak

LD271650 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct p 5 LD

[Text] General Pak Chong-hui, puppet president of South Korea, was killed last night by the director of the South Korean CIA, Kim Chae-kyu. According to the official version put out by Seoul, Pak Chong-hui died accidentally as a result of a shootout which broke out at the dinner table in a restaurant between the president's bodyguard and the intelligence chief. News agencies, however, point out the strange circumstance that all five bodyguards were killed together with the president, while the intelligence boss remained totally unharmed. Subsequent reports express the opinion that the murder of the dictator was planned in advance, and that the latest coup has taken place in South Korea.

Throughout South Korea a state of emergency has been introduced. Power has effectively passed to the hands of the army command headed by the chief of staff, Chong Sung-hwa. Prime Minister Choe Kyu-ha has been appointed as acting president.

He has rushed out a statement in which he maintains that "There will be no change in South Korea's relations with the United States and its other allies." In its turn, the army command has "fully supported" the statement by Choe Kyu-ha.

Thirty-eight thousand American troops on the territory of South Korea have also been placed in a state of combat readiness.

U.S. President J. Carter has sent a message to Choe Kyu-ha in which he notes that the United States "will continue to fulfill firmly its treaty obligations to Seoul." As is known, these obligations include not only "the strengthening of the joint defense," the building in South Korea of new military bases and arms factories, but also the carrying out of joint intelligence-subversive actions in that region. In essence, the United States has set up in South Korea a branch of its CIA and other intelligence services.

The news agencies draw attention to the fact that the killing of the dictator took place soon after the return to Seoul of the U.S. ambassador, who was recalled in order to demonstrate U.S. dissatisfaction with the development of the situation in South Korea. It is also noted that a meeting between the U.S. ambassador and the CIA chief of South Korea, who shot the puppet, took place literally several hours prior to the killing of Pak Chong-hui.

According to foreign news agencies, Washington was alarmed by the unusually wide scope of popular indignation with the puppet regime in South Korea. It assumed such a scale as to threaten not only to sweep away the regime but also to inflict a blow to U.S. interests in that country, which in essence is occupied by the U.S. troops. In order to suppress the dissatisfaction, the dictatorial regime resorted to the force of arms. The troops were ordered to shoot "at anyone resembling a demonstrator." Corruption in the ruling circles and unrestrained price increases also aroused the population's profound dissatisfaction.

AFP says: "No one believes that Pak Chong-hui was killed accidentally." In this connection many observers are of the opinion that in the prevailing situation Washington decided to replace the puppet.

Against the background of what is now happening in Seoul, official Washington's "warning" that "other countries" should not interfere in South Korea's affairs from outside looks very strange. As yet such interference has come and comes only from the United States.

Froklin Commentary

LD271358 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1238 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

["A Change of Puppets"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 27 October, TASS--TASS commentator Sergey Froklin writes:

According to reports from Seoul, on the evening of 26 October, the South Korean dictator Pak Chong-hui was killed in the presidential palace. According to one of the versions disseminated by the South Korean "Information Ministry", this pro-U.S. puppet, who ruled for almost 20 years, was shot by the director of the South Korean Central Intelligence, Kim Chae-kyu. AFP in its first dispatches has reported that the "South Korean president" was killed as the result of a coup which was prepared beforehand. But whatever the reports from the South Korean capital, the present events are connected with a sharp exacerbation in the internal political crisis of the antipeople's puppet regime, which enjoys the support and patronage of the United States.

The regime of Pak Chong-hui had become synonymous in the eyes of the whole world with terror and cruelty, venality and corruption, the suppression of elementary human rights and civil liberties. This caused not a small amount of bother for its bosses. Even many of the closest partners of the United States could not bring themselves to give open support to the dictator.

South Korea has repeatedly been shaken by movements of the broad masses of the population against the regime. The disturbances which gripped South Korea last week were the biggest since 1960, when Syngman Rhee, Pak's predecessor, was removed as a result of a coup. On the eve of the disturbances, 69 members of the South Korean National Assembly relinquished their responsibilities as deputies as a protest against the arbitrary rule of the authorities.

Immediately after the murder of Pak Chong-hui a state of emergency was introduced, press censorship was stepped up, colleges and higher educational institutions were closed, and assemblies and meetings both on the streets and in buildings were banned in South Korea out of the fear of a new flareup of disturbances. Soldiers occupied all important sites in Seoul and a number of other major towns. Tanks were stationed in front of the presidential palace in Seoul. The 38,000 U.S. soldiers stationed in South Korea were also put on combat readiness.

The appointment of Choe Kyu-ha as "acting president" has been announced in Seoul.

Attention has also been drawn by the circumstances that literally on the eve of the murder of Pak Chong-hui, the "foreign minister" of South Korea, Pak Tong-chin, appeared on Seoul television and recalled the statement of U.S. Defense Secretary Brown during his recent visit to Seoul concerning the fact that, at present, relations between Seoul and Washington "are in a satisfactory state."

As the Washington POST writes, U.S. officials have stated that now the key role in Seoul is to be played by Army Chief of Staff Chong Sun-hwa. It is precisely upon him that the obligation has been placed to watch the observance of the emergency measures which have been adopted after the murder in the presidential palace.

In his first statement, Chong Sung-hwa assured that the "activity of the Americans in South Korea will be guaranteed" and that "anyone who violates this point will be arrested, imprisoned and severely punished without trial and investigation." The Washington POST points out further that a U.S. Defense Department spokesman has reported that Choe Kyu-ha, who is "fulfilling the duties of the president" and whose post of prime minister under the dictatorship of Pak Chong-hui was nominal, does not have any real power. The fact that major police measures have been taken against possible mass actions by the South Korean population is clear. As for the murder of Pak Chong-hui, the future will show whether this was a preventative act aimed at replacing one puppet with another. History knows of quite a few similar cases. It suffices to recall how an end was put to Ngo Dinh Diem--the puppet of U.S. imperialism in South Vietnam.

Official Washington's "warning" that "other countries" should not interfere from outside in the affairs of South Korea looks very strange against the background of what is happening now in Seoul. Up to now, such interference has stemmed and is stemming only from the United States.

USSR, DPRK SIGN SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL COOPERATION PROTOCOL

LD270946 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] A protocol was signed in Moscow today at the 12th Session of the Permanent Subcommission on Scientific and Technical Cooperation between the Soviet Union and the DPRK. Our correspondent Vadim Volkov reports:

The exchange of technical documentation, study trips by specialists of various branches of the national economy, the joint research of scientists--all of this wide-ranging activity characterizes the cooperation of our countries in the sphere of science and technology. Hundreds of Soviet specialists are helping the Korean friends to assemble and master the complex equipment which is being dispatched from the Soviet Union. The Government of People's Korea highly values their work. Last year alone more than 240 of our specialists were presented with lofty awards of the DPRK, and at this 12th session the important significance was once again noted of measures which are being carried out to render scientific and technical aid and the training of qualified cadres, especially for the energy, coal and power machine building industries of the DPRK. This was what (Kom Ha-ku), head of the Korean delegation and vice chairman of the Mining Industry Committee, [title as heard] had to say:

[Begin (Kim Ha-ku) recording in Korean, fading into Russian translation] We have just signed a protocol on scientific and technical cooperation between our countries for 1980. We are sure that our relations will develop even more successfully next year. We shall do everything to see that the decisions of the session are fully implemented.

I think, (Kim Ha-ku) says in conclusion, that the development of cooperation in the sphere of science and technology fully responds to the interests of both the Korean and Soviet people. [end recording]

INCREASE IN TROOPS, ARMS SEEN AS GOAL OF BROWN'S TRIP

LD281016 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] United States Defense Secretary Harold Brown has recently visited South Korea and Japan. Here are some points on the results of the tour from our observer Viktor Yenikayev: The Washington-Seoul-Tokyo route is well familiar to the United States defense secretary, and not to him alone. The Far East has become a place of pilgrimage for many high-ranking American diplomats. Yet the goals of all these visits are about the same. Harold Brown's trip was not an exception.

The United States official had brought with him the well-known proposals for stimulating the military activities of South Korea and Japan. In Seoul Harold Brown promised to start the manufacture of new types of weapons and military equipment, including the latest American aircraft of the F-5 type. At the same time Brown did not even mention the earlier promises of the American administration to withdraw some of the United States troops from South Korea. No doubt the Seoul regime was most pleased with such a line taken by the guest from the United States. The South Korean authorities understand perfectly well that American military aid is like oxygen for a patient in a critical condition. It is therefore natural that although he was very busy dealing with mass public protests, Pak Chong-hui spent quite a few hours in the company of the American visitor. The United States defense secretary's statements in Tokyo, where he arrived from Seoul, were made in the same vein. He urged the Japanese leaders to increase military spending, to buy more American weapons. Those who heard him might think that some serious danger was hanging over the United States and its allies in the Far East.

In Japan, too, Harold Brown was greeted by mass demonstrations. About 800,000 Japanese took part in an antiwar day. They demanded the annulment of the Japanese-American military alliance and the evacuation of the Pentagon's bases from Japanese territory. The unfriendly attitude shown by the Japanese to the American guest is easy to explain. He called for Japan's further militarization, although the country's constitution forbids even to have national armed forces. Besides, the Pentagon has about 140 bases in Japan. The territory under these bases is in fact beyond the jurisdiction of the Japanese authorities. It is probably for these reasons that the Japanese can hardly conceal their irritation when they speak about the United States military presence in their country.

No doubt that the United States is well aware of this feeling among the Japanese. As a result, Washington tries to justify its attempts to draw Japan into its military orbit by claiming that it is concerned about that country's national security. Similar claims are accompanying the efforts to set up in the Far East another military bloc with South Korea and Japan as its members. Incidentally, in the opinion of many observers this issue dominated in the talks both in Seoul and Tokyo. Even a person inexperienced in politics understands that the American plans have nothing to do with the strengthening of the security of Japan or South Korea. They are threatened by no one. The United States' attempts to push the two countries on a militarization course and unite them in a military bloc are an integral part of Washington's strategic plan in the Far East. It is obvious that with the help of South Korea and Japan the United States wants to set up a military base which would enable it to control international developments in the region. These plans are not new in American diplomacy. They are similar to Washington's plans for the Indian Ocean, the Caribbean, the Persian Gulf, and other parts of the globe. The visit of Harold Brown has proved once again that in its foreign policy the United States still thinks of military alliances and of applying the position of strength policy in its dealings with other countries.

JAPANESE CP'S ELECTION SUCCESSES HAILED

LD261335 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 79 p 4 LD

[Correspondent Yu. Ydovin report: "In the Vanguard of the Working People's Struggle"]

[Text] Tokyo--The Japanese press continues to comment animatedly on the results of the general elections held 7 October. Devoting a great deal of attention to analyzing the causes of the conservatives' clear failure, at the same time it seeks an answer to the question why the communists achieved such great success.

The Japan Communist Party [JCP] is the only party in the country in which trust has been steadily increasing recently. In spring, at the elections to the local organs of power, it achieved the election of 3,555 of its candidates--227 more than 4 years ago. In the general elections the communists won 39 deputies' mandates. Taking into account the 2 joint candidates of democratic forces who were elected with communist support, the JCP's parliamentary faction in the lower house will henceforth number 41 deputies, and in all the vanguard of the Japanese working people will now be represented by 57 deputies in the country's highest legislative organ. There are 26 female deputies in the Japanese parliament. Thirteen of them are JCP representatives.

On 7 October nearly 5.8 million voters out of the 54.5 million who took part in the elections voted communist. Judging by the results of the vote, JCP influence has increased appreciably in the big industrial cities. In Osaka and Kyoto, for instance, all 10 of the Communist Party candidates nominated became parliamentary deputies. In the old lower house there were four communists elected from Tokyo. Now there are eight. The Communist Party also gained more than 10 deputies' mandates in rural regions which were formerly the conservatives' fief.

During the celebration of the JCP's 57th anniversary, this summer it was reported that the JCP is now one of the biggest Communist parties in the capitalist world. It now unites about 420,000 people. The readership of its central organ--the newspaper AKAHATA--is 3 million, impressive figures if you recall that in 1961, when the current JCP program was adopted, the party's ranks numbered 40,000 members and AKAHATA had 100,000 readers.

Speaking at a press conference on the election results, K. Miyamoto, chairman of the JCP Central Committee Presidium, said that the JCP has always advocated progressive changes in the country's policy, everywhere, in word and in deed. It approached the elections with a clear program. In its preelection statements the JCP did not simply divide the country's political forces into ruling and opposition, but showed the true role of the so-called "middle way parties," which number themselves among the opposition but are in reality a reserve for the Liberal Democrats. The communists called on the Socialist Party to constructively discuss the question of the unity of progressive forces. I think, K. Miyamoto noted, that our party's clear political position and its attacking character at the elections insured support for the JCP among the voters.

Indeed, the JCP's victory is inseparable from its struggle in defense of the interests of the broad people's masses, against the reactionary policy of the Liberal Democratic Party [LDP] government and for a peaceful and neutral Japan. The Japanese Communists resolutely advocate exposing the LDP's policy which serves the interests of big capital. When on the threshold of the elections Prime Minister Ohira announced plans for introducing a tax on consumption, the Communist Party published a statement showing clearly that such an approach to restructuring the country's financial system is advantageous only to the monopolies and will be a blow against the working people. [paragraph continues]

The communists proposed to find ways of improving the state budget by increasing taxation on big capital and reducing the tremendous military expenditure.

This is one example of the Communist Party's persistent day-to-day activity to defend the vital interests of the working people and all the Japanese people--activity which takes place on the basis of the plan published in 1977 for the democratic restructuring of the country's economy and aimed at limiting the might of big capital. The plan envisages devoting greater attention to the people's needs, improving the situation of small businessmen and increasing aid to the peasantry.

Communists also play a leading role in the movement for the unification of Japan's democratic forces. As early as 1971 the JCP called for the creation of a progressive united front and a democratic coalition government under three slogans--For Peace and neutrality in Foreign Policy, For an Economic Policy in Accordance with the People's Interests and For the Defense of Democracy. The party's 12th congress in 1973 elaborated a concrete program for creating a democratic coalition government. However, since then this call has met with no response from either the "middle way" parties or the socialists.

Japanese Communists keep a vigilant eye on the intrigues of reactionary circles. Long before the start of the election campaign and during the campaign the JCP put forward statements and articles mobilizing the public in defense of the people's democratic gains and against the militarization of the country. The party has always devoted the main attention in that sector of the struggle to organizing the nationwide movement for the elimination of the Japanese-American security treaty, under whose terms, as the communists point out, it is impossible to insure Japan's peaceful and independent development, national sovereignty and independence.

JCP election statements noted that the Japanese-American military alliance, which made Japan a strong point for aggression during the Korean and Vietnam wars, is now transforming the country into a base for U.S. aggression and intervention not only in Asia and the Pacific, but also in the Near and Middle East. This is indicated by the U.S. troop exercises on Okinawa, which have become more frequent recently and at which operations are rehearsed by "quick-reaction forces" whose purpose if armed intervention in other countries' affairs.

As K. Miyamoto stated at the Eighth JCP Central Committee Plenum last August, the question of annulling the Japanese-American security treaty is now assuming increasing significance also because that dangerous alliance is becoming the basis for strengthening alliance relations between the United States, Japan, China and South Korea. Beijing, coming out in support of Japanese militarism, is implementing its own hegemonist aspirations increasingly actively, and this is manifested in its aggression against the people of Vietnam, which was condemned by all the world's peace-loving forces.

The Chinese leadership's brazen statements on the possible repetition of aggression against Vietnam, the JCP election program published in August noted, only exacerbate the situation in Indochina and are aimed at undermining peace in Asia and throughout the world. China's rejection of the great principles of socialism, its support for American imperialism's policy of aggression and intervention and the aggressive war which Beijing unleashed against Vietnam, the program noted, are playing into the hands of imperialist forces.

The Communist Party has repeatedly stated that in order to insure peace in Asia and Japan's security great significance is attached to establishing peaceful, friendly relations with the USSR. Unlike the other opposition parties, it resolutely condemned the provocative campaign unleashed when the election struggle was at its height on the "increase in the Soviet military threats." [paragraph continues]

The purpose of his ballyhoo, as AKAHATA noted, is to distract the public's attention from the strengthening of the dangerous military alliance with the United States and from Japan's buildup of its own combat might. Such campaigns, the JCP pointed out, do not accord with the Japanese people's interests and the development of good-neighborly relations with the USSR.

The communists' struggle is meeting with a warm response among the country's broad working people's masses, promotes the growth of the party's prestige and influence, attracts new fighters into its ranks and helps repel attacks by reactionary forces. The results of the general elections indicate that an increasingly large number of working people see the JCP as the expression of their interests.

JAPANESE PRIME MINISTER CALLS FOR BUILDUP OF MILITARY MIGHT

LD281648 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Tokyo, October 28, TASS--Prime Minister Masayoshi Ohira today made new calls for the build-up of Japan's military might. He did so at a military parade held on the Osaka base, (Saitama Prefecture). According to the KYODO News Agency, the head of the Japanese Government, who is simultaneously commander-in-chief of the armed forces, stressed the need of accelerating in the 1980s the pace of the build up of the armed forces of the country within the framework of the Japanese-American military alliance.

More than 5,000 servicemen of the ground force, navy, and airforce, about 300 tanks, armoured carriers, missiles, 80 planes took part in the parade of troops, which was held on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the revival of the Japanese army.

The participation of the prime minister in such events is regarded here as a political demonstration which has the aim to enforce submission to the existence of the army which was formed in violation of the constitution.

Voices in favour of a further consolidation of the system of the Japanese-American security treaty, of the build-up of the Japanese armed forces have lately been sounding ever louder in the government and the Liberal Democratic Party. The prime minister's calls, which were made at the military parade today, testify to a dangerous tendency towards enhancing Japan's role in the U.S. strategic plans in Asia and the Far East.

Japan's armed forces in the recent years have become one of the most powerful in Asia, though the Article Nine of the country's constitution prohibits solution of international disputes through the force of arms and formation of the army. The "Self-Defence Forces" have most up-to-date weapons and combat equipment, including hundreds of fighter-planes, submarines, missiles, tanks, long-range artillery. In the current fiscal year Japan will spend for defence more than two trillion yen, more than any other Asian country, except China.

PRC CONTINUES PROVOCATIONS ALONG BORDER WITH VIETNAM

LD281252 Moscow TASS in English 1206 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Hanoi, October 28, TASS--Continuing to build up troops in the area of the frontier with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Beijing at the same time commits military provocations on the whole of the Vietnamese-Chinese frontier, the VIETNAM NEWS AGENCY reports. The Chinese side fires at the Vietnamese territory, sends through the frontier its agents who are engaged in subversive activities and terrorizes the local population. On October 24, a group of Chinese troops crossed the frontier and fired at the frontier post and a house of peaceful residents in the Thuong Phong community of the Ha Tinh Province. Chinese artillery at the same time opened fire on the Vietnamese settlements at a 25 km long section of the frontier. The shelling continued for more than four hours and a half. A number of Vietnamese frontier guards and civilians were killed or wounded in that aggressive sally, scores of dwelling houses were destroyed and a considerable material damage was inflicted upon the local population. Having been rebuffed by the Vietnamese frontier guards and men of the self-defence forces the trespassers were compelled to retreat to their territory.

China's ruling circles, the VIETNAM NEWS AGENCY stresses, must immediately end their provocative actions and bear full responsibility for the crimes committed.

NEW KAMPUCHEAN AMBASSADOR PRESENTS CREDENTIALS TO KUZNETSOV

LD261336 Moscow TASS in English 1320 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Moscow, October 26, TASS--Keo Prasat, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, has presented credentials at the Kremlin today to Vasiliy Kuznetsov, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first vice-president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Presenting the credentials, Keo Prasat said that the historical victory of the revolutionary patriotic forces on January 7, 1979 put an end to the barbarous Pol Pot-Ieng Sary regime and opened a new era, the era of Kampuchea's renaissance. He stressed that the Kampuchean people will exert maximum efforts to preserve and strengthen friendly Kampuchean-Soviet relations which are based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The ambassador expressed gratitutde to the Soviet people "for a great help and support in building a new Kampuchea, consolidating its positions in the international arena".

Vasiliy Kuznetsov stressed in his speech that the Soviet and Kampuchean peoples are linked by the traditional bonds of friendship and cooperation. The victory of Kampuchea's revolutionary patriotic forces opened wide opportunities for developing and deepening friendly relations and all-round cooperation between the USSR and the PRK in the interests of the peoples of both countries, for the benefit of peace, democracy and social progress. He said that the Soviet Union notes with satisfaction the growth of international prestige of the People's Republic of Kampuchea which is making its contribution to the cause of strengthening peace in Southeast Asia and throughout the world.

TENSION DEVELOPING ON THAI-KAMPUCHEAN BORDER

LD261536 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

["On Thai-Kampuchean Relations"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, October 26, TASS--The situation that has been forming of late at the Kampuchean-Thai border is causing serious concern of the leaders of the two states. Chairman of the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea Heng Samrin sent a message to Thailand's Prime Minister Kriangsak Chamanan concerning the present situation on the border. Prime Minister Kriangsak Chamanan put off indefinitely his planned visit to the Philippines in connection with the "aggravation of the situation on the Thai-Kampuchean border". Reporting this, the Western press tries to conceal from the public the facts that throw the light on real causes of the situation that is shaping itself. Friendship between the peoples of Thailand and Kampuchea has long-time traditions. Normal goodneighbourly relations existed between these two states until China interfered in Kampuchea's internal affairs. The forces making claims to hegemonism in South East Asia would like to sow permanent enmity between Thailand and Kampuchea and also to restore the Pol Pot regime that is guilty of crimes of genocide against the Kampuchean people. Giving open support to the remainder of the Pol Pot gangs that operate in the area of the Thai-Kampuchean border, Beijing and certain imperialist forces would like to turn the region into a zone of conflicts and tension. It is precisely this interference that has complicated the Thai-Kampuchean relations. The Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea, in these conditions, too, was firmly and sincerely carrying the matters toward normalization of relations with Thailand. A message of the chairman of the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea to the prime minister of Thailand says: "Our revolutionary armed forces showed patience and restraint in the conditions of raids staged by the Pol Pot gangs and other reactionaries" that have been thrown out of the Kampuchean territory. The message expresses satisfaction over a statement of Thailand's Prime Minister Kriangsak Chamanan about Thailand's neutrality with regard to the Kampuchean problem. "Unfortunately, the message says, numerous encroachments on the Kampuchean territory and armed invasions contradict the policy of neutrality. We are well aware of the complex situation of your country which lies at the crossing point of external antagonistic forces. Nevertheless, it is difficult for us to see the reason for the thinly concealed support that Thailand's authorities give to reactionaries, enemies of our people, particularly to Pol Pot-Ieng Sary." The message stresses that the Kampuchean and Thai peoples will have to live side-by-side regardless of their political systems. Loyal to traditional Kampuchean-Thai friendship, guided by the interests of peace and stability in South East Asia, the People's Republic of Kampuchea would be happy to establish with the Kingdom of Thailand relations of goodneighbourliness and cooperation based on the principles of mutual respect, independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference in internal affairs, equality, and mutual advantage.

In conclusion Heng Samrin expresses in his message the hope that Kampuchea's stand will be favourably received by Thailand's Prime Minister Kriangsak Chamanan. As is known, Prime Minister Kriangsak Chamanan always showed wisdom and the striving that the policy of goodneighbourliness should prevail in relations between the two neighbouring states. It is to be hoped that this policy prompted by the interests of peace and national interests of the two countries should finally prevail this time, too.

PRAVDA CORRESPONDENT INTERVIEWS KAMPUCHEAN DEFENSE MINISTER

LD2615l7 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 79 p 4 LD

[Special correspondent I. Shchedrov interview with Kampuchean defense minister Pen Sovan: "Kampuchea: The Firm Step of the Revolution"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] During a stopover in Moscow Pen Sovan, vice president of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Council [KPRC], minister of defense and commander in chief of the People's Republic of Kampuchea Armed Forces, received PRAVDA correspondent I. Shchedrov and gave an account of the contemporary situation in his country.

On 7 January 1979 the national liberation revolution under the leadership of the Kampuchean National United Front for National Salvation [KNUFNS], Pen Sovan recounted, secured a victory which ushered in an era of genuine independence and freedom for our country. Kampuchea embarked on a historic new stage--the stage of national rebirth and development in a socialist direction. The victory of the revolution in Kampuchea revealed favorable prospects for improving the situation in Southeast Asia.

The Second KNUFNS Congress took place in Phnom Penh this September and became a very important political event in the country's life. Participating in it were more than 500 delegates representing the working class, peasantry, intelligentsia, Buddhist and Muslim clergy and all the 12 nationalities of our homeland. In the documents adopted the congress summed up the results of the activity of the front and of the KPRC in liquidating the consequences of the genocide regime which had been imposed from outside, in normalizing life and consolidating the people's power.

It was unanimously noted that in a short period the People's Republic of Kampuchea had achieved considerable successes in the political, military, economic and cultural fields. The Second KNUFNS Congress demonstrated the strengthening cohesion of all sections of the population in the face of the threat from international reaction--expansionist and imperialist forces--and the working people's support for the program advanced by the KNUFNS and KPRC for national rebirth and progression along the socialist parth.

So what are our chief achievements?

In the military sphere. During the "dry season," which lasted until June, the Revolutionary Armed Forces with the help of the people's masses wrecked the plans of the Beijing expansionists and of the imperialist circles to wage a so-called "guerrilla war." The remnants of Pol Pot's gangs were largely routed, as were the remnants of various groups of saboteurs and spies trained and infiltrated into our country by the U.S. CIA--the followers of Lon Nol, In Tam and the Khmer Serei. About 50,000 bandits were wiped out during the combat operations.

People's Revolutionary power has been established everywhere in the country. The KPRC is in full control of the whole territory of Kampuchea where about 4.5 million people live and it is taking effective steps to normalize the situation as quickly as possible. In recent months elections to the local organs of people's power have been held in all communities and districts, and administrative committees have been set up in all 19 provinces and in the capital district.

In the economic sphere, as in much else, people's power has had to start virtually from scratch here. Soviet people know what severe damage the pro-Beijing clique inflicted on our country: 3 million people murdered, tortured and dead, cities transformed into wastelands of stone; the total disorganization of economic life. The Kampuchean people found themselves threatened with total extinction.

Despite difficulties of incredible magnitude, 1 million hectares of fields have been sown to food crops. Heightened attention is being devoted to raising poultry and domestic livestock. Thanks to all this we have achieved partial self-sufficiency in foodstuffs in the republic's first and most difficult year.

Western and Beijing propaganda is now engaged in cranking up the latest anti-Kampuchean campaign. This time a hullabaloo is being created over the alleged total inability of the People's Republic of Kampuchea to control the situation over the country's entire territory and to resolve urgent tasks, as a result of which, they say, 2 million people--that is, almost half our people--are this year threatened with inevitable death by starvation. To this accompaniment they are pushing the idea of so-called "humanitarian aid" from certain international organizations to the remnants of counterrevolutionary gangs which are in the pay of the hegemonists' and imperialists' secret services. This approach is an attempt at flagrant interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign country and at legal recognition of traitors of the Kampuchean people who represent no one but themselves and their masters. The Foreign Ministry of the People's Republic of Kampuchea recently confirmed that the KPRC is prepared to accept aid from all countries and organizations provided it is offered without political strings. Any aid must be handed over solely to the KPRC--the sole legitimate government of our country.

I will cite a specific example to show how the "humanitarian aid" looks in reality. For September this year the republic received 41 tons of food from international organizations, but according to foreign press reports counterrevolutionary remnants and "refugees" were given more than 1,000 tons of food, not to mention other goods, via Bangkok. Moreover there is data available to the effect that certain forces hostile to the People's Republic of Kampuchea are trying to disguise as "humanitarian aid" deliveries of weapons and ammunition to Pol Pot's followers.

The fraternal socialist countries, the peace-loving states and progressive and democratic organizations are rendering real and tangible assistance to Kampuchea in the solution of acute problems. Thus the Soviet Union has sent and is continuing to send on an urgent basis essential food including rice, corn and flour. In all, more than 200,000 tons of food have been received from the socialist community countries already. We will never forget this solidarity.

The food question, however, still remains acute. With the help of the fraternal socialist countries, the people's power is making efforts to eliminate the threat of famine which is the legacy of the almost 4 years of rule by the criminal Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique. We make no secret of the fact that we need aid. At the same time I can say with a full sense of responsibility that no one here is dying of hunger.

The people's power is devoting great attention to rebuilding power stations, water supply systems, light and domestic industry. More than 40 enterprises--approximately half of those that existed on the eve of the war--have resumed operations, although not at full capacity. Domestic production of goods in short supply, such as textiles and soap, is being established everywhere. Main railroads have been reopened.

As is known, of the 350 hospitals and polyclinics which existed prior to the Pol Pot forces assuming power, not a single one remains. All the equipment of the medical establishments was destroyed. Out of 685 physicians and pharmacists, only 69 survive. But under these very difficult conditions hospitals have been created in Phnom Penh and also in all 19 provinces thanks to the disinterested assistance of the fraternal countries, including the Soviet Union, and of democratic international organizations.

After a long interval the voices of schoolchildren can once again be heard in the mornings on the country's roads. Although at the moment there is a shortage of teachers, buildings, textbooks, teaching aids and school paraphernalia, our republic nevertheless takes pride in the fact that in August 250,000 children started classes. For after all, it was necessary to start virtually from square one: The Pol Potites had "abolished" the schools. They are now functioning in all cities and in almost all rural communities. We also have to tackle other specific problems of a country which has experienced the horror of genocide. Boarding schools have been set up in provincial centers for children who have lost their parents. All this is our revolution's contribution to the worldwide movement which has been launched in the International Year of the Child.

The international prestige of the People's Republic of Kampuchea has increased and strengthened. The active attempts by the enemies of independent Kampuchea to organize a diplomatic, political and economic blockade of the republic have failed. More than 30 countries and national liberation movements have declared their recognition of the DPRC as the sole legitimate government of Kampuchea. The work of the people's revolutionary tribunal which sentenced Pol Pot and Ieng Sary to death in August 1979 for having pursued a policy of mass genocide, and also the refusal of the Havana conference of heads of state and government of the nonaligned countries to recognize the claim of the traiterous clique overthrown by the people to represent Kampuchea were serious blows to the calculations of the Beijing expansionists and U.S. imperialists to use the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique to screen their continued interference in the internal affairs of our sovereign state. The Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique in the pay of Beijing and their allies, and also the so-called "Government of the National Liberation of Kampuchea" recently knocked together by agents of the American CIA--the "Khmer Serei"--and the motley counterrevolutionary emigre "fronts" whose actions are also directed by Beijing, Washington and other hegemonist and imperialist forces, have no right to represent anywhere either our sovereign state or our people. In this connection Thailand's position arouses great astonishment. The government of that country has repeatedly declared its noninterference in Kampuchea's internal affairs, but the facts attest that certain Thai circles are pandering to the counterrevolutionary elements, are offering them sanctuary and are even giving them support. These actions hardly square with good-neighborliness.

From the very first days of its existence the People's Republic of Kampuchea proclaimed and continues to proclaim a peace-loving foreign policy course, advocating the relaxation of international tension and cooperation with all countries, and it is making an active contribution to consolidating peace and security in Southeast Asia. Friendly relations and cooperation with fraternal Vietnam and Laos and other states of the socialist community headed by the mighty Soviet Union--the first country of victorious socialism--are being strengthened.

The USSR was among the first to recognize the People's Republic of Kampuchea. Kampuchean-Soviet friendship and cooperation are of an equitable nature. The disinterested assistance and effective support from your great country are an important contribution to Kampuchea's speediest elimination of the consequences of the criminal genocide regime and to the work of national rebirth, and they are a manifestation of the genuine internationalism of the great Lenin's motherland. There is no doubt that this friendship and cooperation will develop successfully in the future too as our country progresses along the road to socialism.

IZVESTIYA REPORTS OPENING OF WEU ARMS COLLOQUIUM IN BRUSSELS

LD261315 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 79 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[Correspondent Yu. Ryzhov dispatch: "Arms Magnates' Colloquium"]

[Text] Brussels--A colloquium is taking place in Brussels with the aim of formulating recommendations for the implementation of a common West European policy in the sphere of arms manufacture.

This regular militarist gathering has been organized by the Western European Union [WEU].

Under pressure from magnates of the military-industrial complex the WEU leaders have invited to the Belgian capital approximately 350 West European parliamentarians, military industrialists, representatives of trade unions and the military industry and NATO and EEC experts. The following topics have been submitted to them for discussion: the determination of West Europe's weapons requirements and supply; the political, economic and social conditions for equipping the West European part of the continent with "defensive" materiel; scientific research, development and production of arms in West Europe.

The very first speeches at the colloquium have shown that its participants have again chosen a path which has long been well-trodden by militarists to justify their desires to whip up the arms race. Thus, campaigning for increased cooperation in the arms sphere among the WEU member countries, K.-U. von Hassel, the present chairman of the WEU Assembly, and Belgian Prime Minister W. Martens again referred in their speeches to a mythical "buildup" of Soviet military potential.

'Obedient Tool of NATO'

LD261317 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct Morning Edition p 5 LD

[Correspondent Yu. Ryzhov dispatch: "A Militarist Colloquium"]

[Text] Brussels--A Brussels colloquium organized by the Western European Union [WEU]--a military-political grouping of seven West European countries (Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, Italy, Luxembourg, France and the FRG), which is, as is known, closely linked with NATO--has completed its work.

The colloquium's participants, numbering about 350--for the most part West European industrialists engaged in weapons production--discussed questions connected with drawing up recommendations on the pursuit of a "European policy in the sphere of arms production." You have only to acquaint yourself fleetingly with the themes of the reports and speeches at the colloquium--"Technical Problems of Creating and Manufacturing Arms in West Europe," "An Armament of the Future," "Tomorrow's Tanks and Warplanes," "A Calendar for Arms Replacement," "Industrialists' Opinions in Determining Arms Supply Needs," "On the Work of the Conference of National Directors on NATO Armaments" and others--and their militarist character immediately becomes clear. The appeals of many speakers who are seeking an arms race to suit the military-industrial complex were accompanied by fabrications about a so-called "Soviet threat" and the "growth of the military potential" of the Warsaw Pact states.

They feigned ignorance of the latest initiatives and constructive proposals in the sphere of European disarmament contained in the Berlin speech of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which have confirmed once again the desire of the Soviet Union and other socialist states for the establishment of lasting peace on the European Continent and throughout the world. None of them recalled the successful holding of the all-European Conference on Security and Cooperation at Helsinki nor the documents signed there, nor the Belgrade meeting of representatives of 35 European countries, United States and Canada which proved convincingly that one of today's most urgent problems for our continent, where the concentration of armed forces and armaments is especially high, is the problem of supplementing political detente with military detente.

The colloquium's participants were reminded of this by, in particular, a delegation of the Belgian National Action Committee for Peace and Development which handed to the colloquium's leaders a message which drew their attention to the importance of specific steps toward disarmament. The message also stresses that "the aims of this WEU-sponsored colloquium are at variance with the statements in favor of disarmament made by members of this organization at the UN General Assembly's special session in June 1978."

So the course of the colloquium's work showed that the WEU remains an obedient tool in the hands of the NATO military, of the military-industrial complex and of West Europe's most reactionary circles.

FRANCE, FRG RESIST HUA'S ATTACKS ON USSR

LD272340 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Vitaliy Sobolev with foreign correspondent Valentin Zapevalov--recorded]

[Excerpts] [Sobolev] The opponents of detente have received reinforcement from the Far East. China's head of state, Hua Guofeng, is currently touring a number of Western European countries. The militant statements of the Chinese guest were so provocative that France found it necessary to officially dissociate itself from his remarks.

Hua Guofeng has spent this week in the FRG. We have asked our Bonn correspondent Valentin Zapevalov to discuss Hua Guofeng's visit. China's head of state repeated his inciting speeches in the FRG, is that not so?

[Zapevalov] Hua Guofeng was forced to soften the tone of his statements. However, he could not resist attacking the Soviet Union and the socialist countries in Bonn also, although in a more veiled form. The local press has drawn attention to the fact that the Beijing leader has somewhat altered the former Maoist doctrine about the inevitability of World War III, stating that it can only be postponed. Hua Guofeng also supported the revanchist strivings of certain circles in the FRG.

[Sobolev] How are the results of Hua Guofeng's visit assessed in West Germany?

[Zapevalov] Perhaps the most precise assessment of the meetings and the entire visit was given by the influential bourgeois paper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU which simply described it as (?pointless).

It is no secret that Hua set out for the FRG with great expectations. The Chinese hoped to enlist support for their anti-Soviet stand. However, as it turned out, the sides spoke different languages. There is not and can be no political unity between Bonn and Beijing. The FRG does not have the right to lose the sense of reality in Europe, wrote NEUE RUHRZEITUNG.

During his meetings with the Chinese leader, FRG Chancellor Schmidt affirmed West Germany's desire to continue the policy of detente and to develop all-round relations with the states of Eastern Europe.

The economic and political relations of the FRG and the PRC cannot develop to the detriment of friendship with other countries, including the Soviet Union, FRG Foreign Minister Genscher stated.

[Sobolev] And what was the reaction of the West German public to the visit?

[Zapevalov] The policy of the current Chinese leadership is arousing concern since it aims at destroying the policy of detente and creating military confrontation, (Schulz), the deputy chairman of the SPD youth organization Young Socialists said.

Beijing's hypocrisy, on the one hand stating its striving for peace and on the other hand playing the part of an instigator of war, was noted.

FRG democrats condemned the PRC's actions in Indochina--the aggression against the valiant people of Vietnam, and China's support for Pol Pot's gangs.

ARKHIPOV RECEIVES UK MINISTER OF STATE FOR TRADE IN MOSCOW

LD261654 Moscow TASS in English 1558 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Moscow, October 26, TASS--Ivan Arkhipov, vice chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, received today Cecil Parkinson, British secretary of state for trade now staying in Moscow in connection with the eighth session of the permanent inter-governmental Soviet-British commission on scientific, technical, trade and economic cooperation.

During their conversation they discussed questions of the further development of commercial, economic and industrial cooperation between the USSR and Britain.

First Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade of the USSR Mikhail Kuzmin and the British Ambassador to the USSR Sir Curtis Keeble took part in the conversation.

End of Commission Session

LD262210 Moscow TASS in English 1915 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Moscow, October 26, TASS--The eighth session of the permanent intergovernmental Soviet-British commission for scientific, technical, trade and economic cooperation completed his work here today. For three days the participants in the talks discussed the state of and prospects for Soviet-British business relations. In the period that has passed since the Soviet-British summit meeting in February 1975, on the decisions and understandings of which the commission's activities are based, there occurred marked expansion of trade, economic and industrial cooperation between the USSR and Britain.

This manifested itself, in particular, in the growth of goods turnover between the two countries, which ran at more than 1,500 million roubles in 1978. Over the first nine months of the current year, the goods turnover of Soviet-British trade was much higher than in the corresponding period of 1978. Over the past one year and a half that has passed since the latest session, Soviet foreign trade organizations and British companies have concluded contracts for the delivery of British machines, equipment and technology, including complete plants, for a number of industrial enterprises in the Soviet Union.

It was pointed out at the session that negotiations are now underway about participation of British organizations and firms in the construction, expansion and modernization of enterprises in the USSR in a number of important branches of industry. Along with that, the session also discussed Soviet organizations' participation in the construction, expansion and modernization of Britain's industrial enterprises on the basis of possible deliveries of Soviet equipment, licences and technical documentation. In this field there are already contracts for the delivery of individual types of Soviet machines and licences to Britain, including metalworking equipment, motor transportation means, and tractors. The participants in the commission's session considered the course of scientific and technical cooperation and on the whole expressed their satisfaction with its development. In so doing they emphasized their desire to continue to develop and deepen cooperation both in trade-economic and scientific-technical fields on the basis of mutual advantage. The next, ninth, meeting of the Soviet-British commission is to be held in Britain in May 1980.

ITALY, USSR SIGN ECONOMIC AGREEMENT IN ROME

LD272038 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1455 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Rome, 27 October, TASS--The signing of a 1980-85 USSR-Italy economic cooperation agreement and a protocol on the long-range program for deepening economic and industrial cooperation between the two countries took place here today. On the Soviet side the documents were signed by N.S. Patolichev, USSR minister of foreign trade, and on the Italian side by F.M. Malfatti, the foreign minister. N.S. Ryzhov, the USSR's ambassador to Italy, was present at the ceremony.

The documents note the fruitful development of economic relations between the two countries on a long term basis and confirm the striving in accordance with the principles and provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to further develop and deepen mutually beneficial cooperation. The agreements envisage the further expansion of cooperation between the Soviet foreign trade organizations and Italian enterprises and firms. Cooperation will be implemented primarily in those areas of the economy in which there are favorable opportunities for speedy development. Both sides pledged to further the realization of large-scale projects of mutual interest and to strive to develop trade between Soviet organizations and Italian medium and small-sized firms, as well as to promote the creation of mixed Soviet-Italian societies in Italy.

Speaking at the signing ceremony, F.M. Malfatti referred to the Soviet-Italian documents as exceptionally important. These agreements, he stressed, map out ways of expanding relations between the two countries. We are interested in this cooperation and will do everything necessary to strengthen it, the minister said.

NATO PRESSURES PORTUGAL TO INCREASE DEFENSE SPENDING

LD270248 Moscow in Portuguese to Portugal 2100 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Moscow Radio observer Viktor Vladimirov commentary]

[Text] Portugal has recently become the subject of particular attention by NATO's generals. Early this month, U.S. General Rogers, the supreme commander of the NATO Allied Forces in Western Europe, paid a visit to Lisbon. During his visit in Portugal he spoke stridently about the increasing Soviet military threat. The NATO member countries, he said, who are loyal to Atlantic solidarity, should give military aid to Portugal. In exchange, the general unequivocally demanded from Portugal an increase in its armed forces as a sign of solidarity with NATO.

After Roger's visit, a NATO delegation led by Mumford, NATO assistant secretary general for defense planning and policy, arrived in Lisbon this week. The trip was for the purpose of undertaking a joint study with the Portuguese authorities on issues pertaining to military planning and the country's defense. The increasingly frequent visits to Lisbon by NATO leaders, Viktor Vladimirov writes, the speculations about Atlantic solidarity and NATO's interference in Portugal's military planning and national defense are directed at specific targets. All signs indicate that the NATO strategists view Portugal's contribution to the bloc's war machine as insufficient. They would like to bring the Portuguese Armed Forces up to the level of the so-called NATO standards.

It is known that in the context of such patronizing moves the NATO leaders are putting into practice long-term program of increased armament among the NATO member countries. This program foresees the purchase and manufacture of new weapons and war equipment by the NATO member countries. Last year, the NATO member countries spent the astronomic sum of $189 billion for this purpose. However, under the terms of a NATO decision, its member countries have to increase their military budgets by a minimum of three percent every year. According to specialists' estimates, the NATO countries are expected to spend over $254 billion in 1990 on the arms race. NATO's standards cost the members of the NATO family dearly.

Portugal has not escaped such patronizing policies in the arms fields. At the demand of the NATO leadership, a special NATO brigade has been created in Portugal. This is because the Portuguese Armed Forces had no military unit that measured up to NATO standards. Supplying such a brigade with the most modern war equipment available strained the state budget. After its creation, the issue arose as to how to coordinate its activities with the NATO command. For this purpose, the [word indistinct] "Mars" maneuvers take place in Portugal every year--maneuvers in which officers of the NATO General Staff also take part.

All signs indicate therefore that the NATO leaders, taking into account Portugal's strategic location, are seeking to activate its participation in the military organization of the Atlantic bloc.

NATO PRESSURES PORTUGAL TO INCREASE DEFENSE SPENDING

LD270248 Moscow in Portuguese to Portugal 2100 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Moscow Radio observer Viktor Vladimirov commentary]

[Text] Portugal has recently become the subject of particular attention by NATO's generals. Early this month, U.S. General Rogers, the supreme commander of the NATO Allied Forces in Western Europe, paid a visit to Lisbon. During his visit in Portugal he spoke stridently about the increasing Soviet military threat. The NATO member countries, he said, who are loyal to Atlantic solidarity, should give military aid to Portugal. In exchange, the general unequivocally demanded from Portugal an increase in its armed forces as a sign of solidarity with NATO.

After Roger's visit, a NATO delegation led by Mumford, NATO assistant secretary general for defense planning and policy, arrived in Lisbon this week. The trip was for the purpose of undertaking a joint study with the Portuguese authorities on issues pertaining to military planning and the country's defense. The increasingly frequent visits to Lisbon by NATO leaders, Viktor Vladimirov writes, the speculations about Atlantic solidarity and NATO's interference in Portugal's military planning and national defense are directed at specific targets. All signs indicate that the NATO strategists view Portugal's contribution to the bloc's war machine as insufficient. They would like to bring the Portuguese Armed Forces up to the level of the so-called NATO standards.

It is known that in the context of such patronizing moves the NATO leaders are putting into practice long-term program of increased armament among the NATO member countries. This program foresees the purchase and manufacture of new weapons and war equipment by the NATO member countries. Last year, the NATO member countries spent the astronomic sum of $189 billion for this purpose. However, under the terms of a NATO decision, its member countries have to increase their military budgets by a minimum of three percent every year. According to specialists' estimates, the NATO countries are expected to spend over $254 billion in 1990 on the arms race. NATO's standards cost the members of the NATO family dearly.

Portugal has not escaped such patronizing policies in the arms fields. At the demand of the NATO leadership, a special NATO brigade has been created in Portugal. This is because the Portuguese Armed Forces had no military unit that measured up to NATO standards. Supplying such a brigade with the most modern war equipment available strained the state budget. After its creation, the issue arose as to how to coordinate its activities with the NATO command. For this purpose, the [word indistinct] "Mars" maneuvers take place in Portugal every year--maneuvers in which officers of the NATO General Staff also take part.

All signs indicate therefore that the NATO leaders, taking into account Portugal's strategic location, are seeking to activate its participation in the military organization of the Atlantic bloc.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON USSR VISIT OF PDRY LEADER

Leningrad Meeting With Romanov

LD262246 Moscow TASS in English 2010 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Leningrad, October 26, TASS--'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Yemeni Socialist Party, president of the Presidium of the Supreme People's Council of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, who arrived in Leningrad today was received by Grigoriy Romanov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, the first secretary of the Leningrad Regional Committee of the party. Welcoming the guest, he said that the Leningraders, like all Soviet people, took with satisfaction the successful completion of the Soviet-South Yemeni talks and the signing of the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the two countries and other documents. He acquinted the guest with the main directions of the activities of the Leningrad party organisation in implementation of the decisions of the 25th Congress of the CPSU and realisation of the comprehensive economic and social development plan of Leningrad. 'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il expressed gratitude for the warm reception. He emphasized that the Soviet-South Yemeni talks that took place in Moscow and the joint documents adopted are an historic landmark in relations between the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and the Soviet Union.

Sightseeing in Leningrad

LD281936 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Leningrad, October 28, TASS--'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il, the general secretary of the Central Committee of the Yemeni Socialist Party, president of the Presidium of the Supreme People's Council of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, today continued sightseeing in Leningrad. He is staying here under the programme of the official friendly visit in the USSR. The distinguished guest went to the Piskaryov Memorial Cemetery where over half a million citizens and defenders of the city who lost their lives in the years of the Second World War were buried in common graves. 'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il expressed his feelings in an entry in the visitors' book: "This cemetery is a symbol of grandeur and heroism of the Soviet people who made the greatest sacrifice, defending their mother-land. We admire the courage of Leningraders who showed by their exploit how to fight against the enemy for victory. Glory to the great Soviet people, the heroic people". A guard of honour of soldiers of the Leningrad garrison was lined up in the memorial's field. The national anthems of the two countries were played.

Sightseeing in the city, the guest visited new housing construction areas. 'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il also took a ride along Leningrad's central thoroughfares.

A dinner was given in honour of the distinguished guest. It passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere. Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Secretary of the Leningrad Regional Committee of the Party Grigoriy Romanov and 'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il exchanged toasts.

Departure From Leningrad

LD291154 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 29 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Having completed his visit, 'Abdal-Fattah Isma'il, secretary general of the Yemeni Socialist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Supreme People's Council Presidium of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, left Leningrad today.

At the airport he was seen off by Romanov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Leningrad Obkom; Zaykov, chairman of the Leningrad Gorispolkom; and other officials.

USSR-PDRY Treaty

LD291115 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 79 pp 1-2 LD

[Text of "Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation Between the USSR and the PDRY"]

[Text] The USSR and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen [PDRY],

Considering that the further development and strengthening of the relations of friendship and all-round cooperation which have become established between them accord with the vital national interests of the two countries' peoples and serve the cause of consolidating peace and security throughout the world,

Motivated by the desire to promote in every way the development of peaceful relations between states and fruitful international cooperation,

Fully determined to develop the socioeconomic achievements of the peoples of the USSR and the PDRY and to come out for the unity and cooperation of all forces fighting for peace and national independence, democracy and social progress,

Inspired by the ideals of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and racism in all their forms and manifestations,

Attaching great significance to the two countries' cooperation in the cause of the struggle for a just and lasting peace in the Near East,

Reasserting their loyalty to the aims and principles of the UN charter, including the principles of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity and noninterference in internal affairs,

Wishing to develop and strengthen the existing relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries,

Have agreed on the following:

Article 1

The high contracting parties solemnly declare their determination to strengthen the indestructible friendship between the two countries and to steadily develop political relations and all-round cooperation on the basis of equality, respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity and noninterference in each other's internal affairs.

Article 2

The high contracting parties will cooperate closely and in every way to insure the conditions for preserving and further developing their peoples' socioeconomic gains and respect for the sovereignty of each party over all their natural resources.

Article 3

The high contracting parties will make efforts to strengthen and expand mutually advantageous economic, scientific and technical cooperation between them. To this end the parties will develop and deepen cooperation in the sphere of industry, agriculture, fisheries, the utilization of natural resources and the planning of national economic development and in other spheres of the economy, and also in training national cadres. The parties will expand trade and navigation on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual advantage and most-favored-nation status.

Article 4

The high contracting parties will promote the development of cooperation and exchange of experience in the sphere of science, culture, art, literature, education, health care, the press, radio, television, the cinema, tourism, sport and other spheres.

The parties will promote the development of contacts and cooperation between organs of state power and professional and other public organizations, and also the expansion of direct ties between enterprises and cultural and scientific institutions with a view to more profound familiarization with the life, labor, experience and achievements of the two countries' peoples. The parties will stimulate the development of contacts between the two countries' working people.

Article 5

The high contracting parties will continue to develop cooperation in the military sphere on the basis of the relevant agreements concluded between them in the interests of strengthening their defense capability.

Article 6

The USSR respects the PDRY's policy of nonalinement, which is an important factor in the development of international cooperation and peaceful coexistence.

The PDRY respects the USSR's peace-loving foreign policy, which is aimed at strengthening friendship and cooperation with all countries and peoples.

Article 7

The high contracting parties will continue to make every effort to defend international peace and the peoples' security, to deepen the relaxation of international tension, to extend it to all regions of the world, to embody it in concrete forms of mutually advantageous cooperation between states, to settle international disputes by peaceful means, to transform the principle of the nonuse of force into an effective law of international life and to eliminate all manifestations of the policy of hegemonism and expansionism from the practice of international relations. The parties will actively promote the cause of universal and complete disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, under effective international control.

The high contracting parties will continue the active struggle against the intrigues of imperialism and for the final eradication of colonialism and racism in all their forms and manifestations.

The parties will cooperate with each other and with other peace-loving states in support of the peoples' just struggle for their freedom, independence, sovereignty and social progress.

Article 9

The high contracting parties will help in every way to insure a lasting and just peace in the Near East and, to that end, to achieve an all-embracing Near East settlement.

Article 10

The high contracting parties will promote the development of cooperation between Asian states, the establishment of relations of peace, good-neighborliness and mutual trust between them and the creation of an effective security system in Asia on the basis of joint efforts by all states of that continent.

Article 11

The high contracting parties will consult with one another on important international questions directly affecting the two countries' interests.

In the event of situations arising which create a threat to peace, the parties will seek to make immediate contact with a view to coordinating their positions in the interests of eliminating the threat which has arisen or restoring peace.

Article 12

Each of the high contracting parties solemnly declares that it will not enter into military or other alliances or take part in any groupings of states, or actions or measures directed against the other high contracting party.

Article 13

The high contracting parties declare that the provisions of the present treaty do not run counter to their commitments under existing international treaties, and pledge not to conclude any international agreements incompatible with this treaty.

Article 14

Any questions which may arise between the high contracting parties concerning the interpretation or application of any provision of the present treaty will be resolved bilaterally, in a spirit of friendship, mutual respect and mutual understanding.

Article 15

The present treaty will operate for 20 years from the day of its coming into force.

If neither of the high contracting parties declares its wish to end the treaty's operation 6 months before the expiration of the said term, it will remain in force for the ensuing 5 years, and so forth, until such time as one of the high contracting parties gives warning in writing of its intention to end its operation 6 months before the expiration of the current 5-year period.

Article 16

The present treaty is subject to ratification and will come into force on the day of the exchange of instruments of ratification, which will take place in Aden.

The present treaty is composed in two copies, each in Russian and Arabic, and the two texts have equal force.

Done in Moscow, 25 October 1979.

[Signed] for the USSR: L. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

For the PDRY: 'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il, general secretary of the Yemen Socialist Party Central Committee and chairman of the PDRY Supreme People's Council Presidium

Zlatorunskiy Commentary

LD261424 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1200 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Here is a commentary by our commentator Aleksey Zlatorunskiy about the conclusion of the talks between the Soviet Union and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen:

The talks between Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and other Soviet statesmen and 'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Yemeni Socialist Party [YSP] and chairman of the PDRY Supreme People's Council Presidium, and his companions have been concluded in Moscow.

In the course of these talks, held in a cordial atmosphere, a large number of issues concerning bilateral relations and general international issues were discussed. The situation in the Middle East, and the Arabian Gulf region, the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean specifically received close analysis.

Following the conclusion of the talks Soviet-Yemeni documents were signed, namely, the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the PDRY, to strengthen relations between the CPSU and the YSP during the period 1980-1983, and also the economic and technical cooperation protocol between the two countries. The treaty of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the PDRY is of special significance because it goes beyond the framework of bilateral relations and outlines the main foreign political principles which both countries have pledged to be guided by.

The treaty says in the beginning that it will serve the cause of strengthening peace and security in the whole world and the consolidation and development of fruitful relations of international friendship and cooperation among nations. The treaty underlines the striving of the Soviet Union and the PDRY to struggle for the unity and the cooperation of all forces struggling for peace, national independence, democracy and social progress against imperialism, colonialism and racism in all their various forms and [word indistinct]. The treaty also underlines the striving of both countries to cooperate in the cause of the struggle for lasting and just peace in the Middle East (?in accordance with) the aims and principles of the UN charter, including the principles of respecting sovereignty, territorial unity, and noninterference in others' internal affairs.

The Soviet-Yemeni summit talks and the signing of the joint documents have opened a new page in relations between the two countries, for they (?widen) the scope of bilateral political and economic cooperation in all spheres and have become a big contribution to the strengthening of traditional Soviet-Arab cordial relations in general and have assisted in strengthening the unity of the forces of peace and progress. In these lie their main importance.

Timoshkin Commentary

LD262252 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1700 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Aleksandr Timoshkin commentary]

[Excerpts] During his official and cordial visit to the Soviet Union, 'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il held fruitful talks with leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet state: Leonid Brezhnev, Andrey Gromyko, Dmitriy Ustinov and Boris Ponomarev. The talks resulted in the signing of very important documents which define in the long-term the development of comprehensive relations between the Soviet Union and the PDRY. The most important of these documents is undoubtedly the treaty of friendship and cooperation which declares in the first of its historic articles that the two high contracting sides publicly announce their resolve to strengthen the firm friendship between them and constantly develop the political relations and comprehensive cooperation on the basis of equality and respect for national sovereignty and territory integrity and noninterference in domestic affairs.

The Soviet Union and the PDRY in the treaty affirmed their desire to develop cooperation in all economic, scientific, technical and cultural fields. And gentlemen, I would like to draw your attention to the fifth article of the Soviet-PDRY treaty. This article affirms the endeavor of the two friendly states to continue development of cooperation in the military field on the basis of agreements concluded in this connection between them to strengthen their defensive power.

I believe that the importance of Soviet-Arab cooperation in this field is not questioned by any Arab who is firmly determined to continue the active struggle for removing the consequences of the Israeli aggression and recovering the national legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and against the imperialist attempts to revive the colonialist gunboat diplomacy. Strengthening the defense capability of the Arab states which stand in the front lines of this struggle in cooperation with the Soviet Union is a vital necessity because an extremely grave situation has now emerged in the area.

The two sides who signed the treaty yesterday in Moscow are fully resolved to search for a peaceful solution to the Middle East crisis. In this connection, the ninth article of the treaty said: The two high contracting sides will help by all means to guarantee a firm and just peace in the Middle East and to reach a comprehensive settlement in the area for this purpose.

As a result of the visit of 'Abd al-Fattah Isma'il, the two sides to the treaty once again affirmed their unchanging attitude on this very acute international issues. They believe that Israel must unconditionally return to the 1967 borders. The aggressors, therefore, are obliged to withdraw from the territory which they usurped, and they must return to the 1967 borders. The aggressors, therefore, are obliged to withdraw from the territory which they usurped, and they must return the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including the right to establish their independent state.

I am convinced, gentlemen, that you agree with me that the Soviet-PDRY treaty of friendship and cooperation is not directed at any third party in the area or in all of Asia.

Article 10 of the treaty frankly says that the Soviet Union and the PDRY will assist the development of cooperation between Asian states and the establishment of relations of peace and good-neighborliness and mutual confidence and the establishment of an effective system of security in Asia on the basis of the joint efforts of all the states of this continent.

Thus, gentlemen, it becomes amply clear from the contents of the treaty which was signed in Moscow that the Soviet Union and the PDRY reject the plans to set up closed military-political blocs in the Middle East and in Asia in general, particularly those blocs which are controlled by the imperialist powers.

PDRY Paper Cited

LD282306 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Aden, October 28, TASS--The signing of the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen is an event of great significance for consolidation of friendship between the parties and peoples of the two countries on the basis of proletarian internationalism, writes the South Yemeni newspaper ATH-THAWRI. The Yemenist Socialist Party regards the consolidation of relations with the USSR as a contribution to the struggle for the victory of socialist society in Democratic Yemen.

The treaty of friendship and cooperation opens to the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen new favourable prospects for the development of the national economy, for raising the material and spiritual level of the life of the South Yemeni working people, the newspaper writes. This document is also of great political significance for Democratic Yemen. It guarantees further development of the country on the basis of scientific socialism, is a vivid evidence of equal relations between the USSR and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

The results of the visit, ATH-THAWRI stresses, go beyond the framework of relations between the USSR and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. Faced with new intrigues of forces of imperialism, Zionism and reaction, Soviet-Arab friendship is becoming an effective instrument in the struggle for the consolidation of national independence of Arab countries, for the recognition of the lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine and, above all, its right to create its own independent state.

The newspaper stresses that the government and people of the Democratic Yemen highly assess the results of the visit of a party and government delegation of Democratic Yemen to the USSR, which is an evidence of the strength of the principled relations of friendship between the two countries, of the community of political aims and interests of the peoples of the two countries in the struggle for the victory of noble ideals of socialism.

Soviet TV Interview

LD261904 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Moscow, October 26, TASS--"We are happy and proud of being given an opportunity to make a visit to the USSR. The visit became a big historic event in the development of Soviet-South Yemen relations," 'Abd al-Fatah Isma'il, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Yemeni Socialist Party, president of the Presidium of the Supreme People's Council of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, said in an interview with Soviet television today.

To us it is a great honor that the visit has been made under the patronage of Leonid Brezhnev. This visit deepened still more the relations of friendship and cooperation between the two countries, the Yemeni leader pointed out.

Our conversations with Leonid Brezhnev were held in the spirit of friendship, comradeship and frankness. We discussed various problems which are of mutual interest to our countries and peoples as well as topical international problems including the situation in the Middle East. During the talks and conversations we discussed questions of supporting the struggle of Arab peoples and, in particular, the Palestinian people for the restoration of their legitimate rights to establish an independent state of their own, 'Abdal-Fattah Isma'il pointed out.

We hold that this visit will strengthen still more bilateral contacts between the CPSU and the Yemeni Socialist Party, between our states, between the Soviet and South Yemeni peoples, 'Ali al-Fattah Isma'il said. He expressed deep gratitude to all Soviet leaders and particularly to Leonid Brezhnev for the understanding, help and support which they display and render to the Yemeni people, to its revolution and the party.

IRANIAN OIL WORKERS DEMAND U.S. EXTRADITE SHAH

LD281546 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Tehran, October 28, TASS--Workers of the National Iranian Oil Company demanded that the United States Government should extradite to Iran the former Iranian monarch staying in New York. A statement of the oil workers' union published here says that if the United States refuses to grant the workers' demand, they will block all deliveries of Iranian oil to the United States.

U.S. ATTITUDE CHANGE MARKS SHAH'S 'OPPORTUNE' ENTRY

LD271727 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 24 Oct 79 LD

[Igor Savchenko commentary]

[Text] Observers say that it is not only the expertise of American doctors that has persuaded the deposed shah to undertake his journey, but several serious factors drew him to the United States. Billions of dollars, at least $17- $25 billion which he stole from the wealth of the people of Iran, have been deposited in American banks for safekeeping. The shah has invested billions in companies, casinos and hotels there. His closest aides, who helped him in acts of oppression against the Iranian people and bloody suppression of their slightest opposition, and in making the nation dependent on U.S. capital, are living in the United States. Thus, the executioners of the people of Iran under General Azhari, General Oveissi and others have taken refuge in the United States.

The deposed shah has many friends among well-known government personalities, representatives of monopolies and military leaders in the United States who have still not forgotten their golden period when Mohammad Reza Pahlavi gave them the opportunity to plunder Iran by flooding the country with expensive nonessentials, thus making tens of billions of dollars for themselves.

In their time, these friends of the deposed shah exerted all their efforts in resorting to arms in order to suppress the struggle of the Iranian people against imperialism and to retain the despotic and selfish shah on the throne.

The shah's downfall did not decreased their partiality for this faithful friend one iota. For example one such friend, Henry Kissinger, the former U.S. secretary of state, recently said: Whether you like it or not the shah was, in any case, the best ally of the United States for 37 years. For this reason he deserves the best treatment from Americans.

These friends are still hopeful of destroying the republic in Iran by using the deposed shah and his followers and CIA agents and their terrorist groups. Last summer Ayatollah Khomeyni said that these activities by the deposed shah's American friends gravely threaten the republic in Iran.

With what new plans against the Islamic Republic of Iran will they acquaint the deposed shah during his stay in the United States?

There was a time when officials in Washington, fearing the anti-imperialist stand of Iran and afraid of losing all their interests there, outwardly sought to avoid the deposed shah, announcing that a trip by him to the United States was inopportune and untimely. As is known, Washington now counts Mohammad Reza Pahlavi's residence in the United States as opportune and timely.

IRANIAN CUSTOMS DISCOVER SECRET DOCUMENTS, FILMS IN U.S. BAGGAGE

LD251626 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Tehran, October 26, TASS--Over a hundred boxes with secret documents and film tapes containing information about the Iranian Armed Forces, communications, Air Force and air defence facilities were discovered by the customs officials of the Tehran airport Mehrabad while clearing the luggage of U.S. citizens before departure for the United States.

According to newspaper ETTELA'AT the Iranian security services had been looking for these documents for several months and these were discovered quite by chance after the Iranian Government has adopted measures to tighten customs control in connection with the increased number of cases of illegal expatriation of currency.

IRANIAN COMMISSION TO BE SENT TO KORDESTAN

LD271859 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Tehran, October 27, TASS--The PARS Agency has issued a statement by the office of the Iranian prime minister on setting up a special commission, including Interior Minister H. Sabbaghian, Defence Minister M. Chamran, Minister of State and head of the Planning-Budget Organisation K. Sahabi and Minister of State Foruhar. The commission, which is to be sent to Iranian Kordestan, has the power to take decisions on all questions in connection with the settlement of the Kurdish problem and acts on behalf of the country's government.

ECONOMIC DIFFICULTIES ADD TO PROBLEMS IN IRAN

LD261135 Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 18 Oct 79 p 3 LD

[APN-attributed V. Svetozarov article: "Iran: The Republic's Complex Problems"]

[Text] Almost 6 months have elapsed since the proclamation of the Islamic Republic but the situation in the country remains quite tense. Clashes between detachments of Kurdish insurgents and government troops are continuing. [paragraph continues]

The heat of the struggle between leftwing democratic forces and the influential forces among the clergy which are implacable toward the opposition is not abating in Tehran and a number of other major cities.

The complex domestic political situation in Iran is supplemented by economic instability. The crisis phenomena in economic life inherited by the young republic have been considerably intensified because of a considerable cutback in production. Unemployment and inflation are increasing in the country. Interruptions in the supply of certain foodstuffs and essential consumer goods to the population have provided fertile soil for the unrestrained hiking of prices. The machinations of the "black market" kings have assumed such a scale that a special instruction has been approved for the revolutionary courts which provides for the execution of particularly large-scale speculators.

In its economic policy the Iranian Government does not intend to limit itself to partial measures. Among the country's leading circles there is a growing understanding of the need to elaborate a unified and long-term program for developing the country's industry and agriculture. To this end a seminar opened in Tehran in mid-September in which representatives of the clergy, scientists and the leaders of a number of enterprises took part.

While the seminar was at work the Iranian Bureau of Revolutionary Projects publishes a report on the main avenues of the country's socioeconomic development. It stresses that three sectors are recognized in Iran's economic life: the private, state and mixed sectors. Here the state sector, which covers the basic sectors of the economy and the largest industrial enterprises, is intended mainly to "create favorable conditions for the private sector's activity." Profit, the authors of the report assert, will be shared between the work force, society and private capital.

So far all this represents merely the theoretical outlines of the country's socioeconomic course. But these give a clear glimpse of the desire of Iran's present leaders to reconcile the opposing interests of the working classes and the bourgeoisie by appealing to the Islamic religion. Will the multimillion-strong working masses, and primarily the industrial proletariat, be satisfied with this? It is doubtful.

It is hard to expect the Iranian working people, who linked the fall of the monarchy with their hopes of a substantial improvement in their situation, to renounce the struggle for their rights now, under new political conditions, especially as no marked improvement in their life can yet be observed. Both the workers and the overwhelming majority of employees are concerned by the considerable rise in prices. This year alone inflation has reached 50 percent. The army of unemployed, according to the most modest estimates, numbers over 1 million. The mass departure of foreign workers and specialists from the country has not led to any substantial expansion of the hired work force market. The government measures to ease the working people's situation have so far been confined to the decision to raise minimum wages as of March next year.

That is why workers' strikes are flaring up at many state and private enterprises. The working people are demanding the establishment of an 8-hour working day, the improvement of housing conditions, labor safety and the creation of independent trade unions.

Dissatisfaction has also gripped the workers of the vitally important oil-extracting sector. Khomeyni's personal representative, the religious figure Eshraqi, has gone to Khuzestan province, where the largest oilfields are located, to examine their demands. Eshraqi has had several meetings with workers and employees of the National Iranian Oil Company and has visited workers settlements.

Eshraqi was forced to admit publicly that although the oil industry workers' position is better than that of working people in other industries, they are a long way from according with minimum requirements for insuring a tolerable existence.

A mere admission of the oil industry wokers' plight will not make their life easier. They expect from the government a specific and clear reply to their demands, as do textile workers, construction workers, printing plant and assembly plant workers and the other detachments of the working class advocating truly profound, democratic transformations in the working people's interests.

TENSE SITUATION CONTINUES IN IRANIAN KORDESTAN

LD281524 Moscow TASS in English 1349 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Tehran, October 28, TASS--A tense situation persists in Iranian Kordestan. As was stated by a representative of "the Guards of the Islamic Revolution" corps--a pro-government Muslim formation, the town of Mahabad has been fully controlled by the Kurdish insurgents for more than a week now. The newspaper Tehran TIMES reports that insurgents have barred all roads leading to the area of the location of the governmental troops near Mahabad and prevent food supplies from reaching there.

According to the newspaper BAMDAD, the situation has sharply aggravated in the towns of Saqqez, Sanghdaj, Bukan and Baneh. All institutions and shops are closed there, exchanges of fire periodically flare up near army garrisons. Mass demonstrations were held in those towns yesterday. The demonstrators demanded that the authorities should cancel their decision on the dismissal of a group of Kurdish teachers. According to a statement of the governor of Marivan, the personnel of the gendarmc posts, located in the area of the town, surrendered without fighting to Kurdish insurgents.

The press reports yesterday's meeting in Qom between Ayatollah Khomeyni and four ministers on whom the government laid the task of ensuring normalisation of the situation in Kordestan. As was stated by the Minister of the Interior Sabbaghian, considered in the course of the meeting were the government's programmes for the development of the Kurdish areas. Also approved was a plan envisaging withdrawal from Iranian Kordestan of "Guards of the Islamic Revolution" units, investigation into violations committed by Islamic courts and making gendarmerie and police responsible for maintaining law and order in the Kurdish areas.

IRANIAN PAPER REPORTS SAVAK AGENTS' PLOT

LD261622 Moscow TASS in English 1947 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Tehran, October 26, TASS--In Iran's government apparatus, a group of plotters has been exposed, which consisted of former officials of the shah's political police, SAVAK. The activities of the group were aimed at undermining the new republican regime.

According to newspaper ETTELA'AT, one of the plotters, an agent of SAVAK, 'Abdolhasan Nik-kholq, had managed after the revolution to occupy the post of deputy minister of trade and then deputy minister of agriculture. The exposed network of plotters had a direct role in concluding commercial deals with foreign organisations. A number of plotters have been arrested.

DAYAN CITED ON ISRAELI PLANS TO EXPAND SETTLEMENTS

LD272323 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1413 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

["Behind the Screen of Talks"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 27 October, TASS--Commentator Yuriy Dashkov writes:

Former Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Dayan said on Friday in an interview with a Tel Aviv radio correspondent that the Israeli Government intends to annex occupied Arab territories on the West Bank of the Jordan River and in the Gaza sector at the end of the 5-year term of "administrative autonomy." A decision to this effect was made by the Israeli Cabinet at the beginning of this year.

The implementation of this design is actually in progress and 133 militarized Israeli settlements have been established on the occupied Arab territories. The land which has been wrested from the Arabs for these settlements comprises 27 percent of the entire territory of the West Bank of the Jordan. In 5 years it is planned to settle a further 27,000 Israeli families here. Nearly $2 billion have been allocated for this purpose.

The Arab population is being forcibly driven off the occupied lands. Since 1967, for example, the number of Arabs in Jerusalem and the West Bank has been reduced by 32 percent. A report by a special commission of the UN Security Council which has investigated the situation in the Israeli-occupied territories states that the development of Israeli settlements and the forcible expulsion of the Arab population is leading to a serious "change in the geographical and demographic character of the occupied territories, including Jersualem." These changes, the commission said, should be considered violations of the fourth Geneva convention on the defense of a civilian population at time of war and of the UN resolutions on this issue.

The Israeli-Egyptian talks which are in progress here under U.S. auspices on "administrative autonomy" for the occupied territories are, as Dayan's revelations indicate, only a screen to cover Israel's expansionist plans.

SAUDI KING CALLS FOR RESTORATION OF PALESTINIAN RIGHTS

LD281652 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Beirut, October 28, TASS--Saudi Arabia will exert every effort for the restoration of lawful national rights of the Arab people of Palestine and for creation of an independent Palestinian state, said King Khalid of Saudi Arabia. Speaking before pilgrims who arrived in Mecca, he stressed that Israel must withdraw from all occupied Arab lands, including the eastern part of Jerusalem.

COMMENTARY PRAISES SOVIET-ALGERIAN RELATIONS

LD271852 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

[Nikolay Antonov commentary: "Soviet-Algerian Cooperation on the International Level"]

[Text] The 25th CPSU Congress said that Soviet citizens support the forces of progress, democracy and national independence in developing countries and elsewhere. Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said that we deal with these forces as we deal with our friends and comrades in the struggle.

This also applies to Algeria. The peoples of the USSR and Algeria are linked by common interests in building a new life and new democratic and just relations among nations on a progressive basis. They are also linked by feelings of deep friendship, mutual respect, sympathy and solidarity. Soviet citizens on the eve of the 25th glorious anniversary of the Algerian revolution point with deep satisfaction to the fruitful cooperation of our two countries at the international level, cooperation which has been developing since Algeria won its independence.

The USSR looks with respect on Algeria's foreign policy, which is based on the principles of nonalinment and which is hostile to colonialism and imperialism. Algeria is an active participant in the nonalined movement which is becoming an important factor in international politics. Algeria also aids consolidation of the anti-imperialist policy in this movement and the consolidation of its progressive direction.

Regarding the main issues of our age, the attitudes of the USSR and Algeria agree and are similar. This primarily concerns the issues of the consolidation of peace and the deepening of international relaxation and complete and general disarmament. The national charter states that Algeria struggles for peace, peaceful coexistence, noninterference in the internal affairs of states and settlement of international problems through negotiations. Algeria welcomes the development of international relaxation and considers it necessary to spread it throughout the world. As is known, the fourth FLN congress, which confirmed the firmness of the principles of the national charter, called for continuation of the struggle for comprehensive disarmament, the elimination of hotbeds of tension, and the elimination of foreign military bases in other peoples' lands.

Algeria supports Soviet initiatives aimed at halting the arms race and avoiding nuclear war, particularly Leonid Brezhnev's historic peace initiatives issued in Berlin on 3 October on the unilateral reduction of Soviet forces in central Europe by 20,000 soldiers and 1,000 tanks. These proposals, stemming from the drive to consolidate peace in Europe, are of ocuse very important to the Mediterranean region which borders Europe.

As is known, Algeria pays special attention to the consolidation of peace in the Mediterranean and calls, like the USSR, for the same military measures to consolidate trust in this region, the measures adopted by the Helsinki conference of European security. It also calls for the transformation of this region into a region of world peace. The USSR and Algeria call for a comprehensive political settlement in the Middle East. To achieve this it is necessary to liberate all Arab lands occupied by Israel since 1967 and guarantee the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and the establishment of a Palestinian state. Both countries condemn the separate deals concluded by the Egyptian leadership with Israel, which are harming the vital interests of the Arab peoples and which prevent the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The USSR points out with satisfaction that Algeria stands in the front line of the Arab countries which have demonstrated their solidarity on the basis of the resolutions of the Baghdad meetings to firmly confront the line of anti-Arab separate deals. From the premise of this common attitude, the USSR and Algeria call for the spreading of the real spirit of equality, justice, mutual benefit, respect for the rights of peoples and states to dispose of their natural resources as they wish in international economic relations. The close cooperation successfully developing between the two countries at the international level reflects the relations of fraternal friendship which unite our two countrirs and which have become traditional and which fully agree with the vital interests of the Algerian and Soviet peoples and the interests of all forces struggling for peace, national independence and social progress.

PRAVDA DEEMS SECRET S. AFRICAN NUCLEAR TESTS 'EXTREMELY LIKELY'

LD291339 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 79 p 5 LD

[Article by V. Korovikov under the rubric "Following an Agency Dispatch": "Nuclear Explosion in South Africa?"]

[Text] Washington, 26 October, REUTERS--A U.S. State Department representative stated that there is significant evidence, obtained by surveillance satellites, that a nuclear device was exploded on 22 September in the southern Africa area.

It has long been known that work on the creation of nuclear weapons has been going on in earnest in South Africa. A whole secret town, Valindaba, was built near Pretoria. The South African authorities themselves have reported the development of new and effective methods of enriching radioactive materials necessary for the creation of nuclear bombs. A nuclear reactor has been in operation for several years in Valindaba. Many dozens of specialists from South Africa trained for years in scientific and industrial enterprises connected with nuclear research and production in the United States, the FRG and other Western countries. It is also known that Israel and South Africa have long been collaborating in this sphere.

This country and racist-occupied Namibia are rich in uranium ores. South Africa is the capitalist world's third biggest extractor of uranium. Pretoria's rulers hope to use uranium to strengthen the country's energy balance (South Africa does not have its own oil) and equip its rapidly growing army with nuclear weapons. The South African racists intend to use these mass destruction weapons to threaten and blackmail independent, free Africa and terrorize the oppressed nonwhite population of South Africa. You only have to recall South African Prime Minister P. Botha's recent threats concerning the military occupation of Rhodesia if the patriotic forces come to power there. It is for these reasons that the South African Government has hitherto refused to subscribe to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

There are numerous pieces of evidence of intensive preparation of nuclear weapons in South Africa. A test zone being prepared for nuclear tests was discovered more than a year ago in the Kalahari Desert. This public exposure forced the racists to abandon the planned explosions for a time. It is extremely likely that these tests have now been carried out in complete secrecy.

The South African racists have long dreamed of acquiring a nuclear bomb. And if they have now achieved this it is largely the result of close cooperation with military-industrial corporations in Western powers which are directly responsible for the creation in the southern part of the continent of a powerful aggressive military machine which jeopardizes peace in this part of the world and the freedom of the African peoples.

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

SUPREME SOVIET SCHEDULED TO MEET 28 NOVEMBER

LD271228 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

[Text] A decree by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium:

On the convocation of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees that the Second Session of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the 10th Convocation will be convened on 28 November 1979 in the city of Moscow.

[Signed] Brezhnev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Georgadze, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

SHEVARDNADZE DELIVERS REPORT AT GEORGIAN PARTY PLENUM

LD261912 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] At the plenum of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee in Tbilisi today the tasks of the Republican Party organization in further improving training, deployment and upbringing of cadres were discussed.

It was noted that the republic's economic potential has risen considerably during the past few years. The number of enterprises lagging behind is falling. The share of articles with the quality sign is growing. Agriculture, science and culture are developing successfully. All this is the result of the purposeful implementation of the cadre policy.

A report was delivered by Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee.

Unveiling of Monument

LD272252 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Text] A monument to Komsomol heroes was unveiled today at the Komsomolskiy Gorodok which is situated in the outskirts of Tbilisi. Present at the unveiling of the monument was Comrade Shevardnadze.

ELECTRONICS MINISTER DECORATED FOR SERVICES

LD280830 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has awarded Aleksandr Ivanovich Shokin, hero of socialist labor and USSR minister of the electronics industry, the Order of Lenin and a second gold hammer and sickle medal for outstanding services to the development of the electronics industry and on the occasion of his 70th birthday. A bronze bust will be erected in his native area to mark the hero's labor exploits.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

INDUSTRIAL FIGURES FOR THIRD QUARTER RELEASED

LD272907 Moscow TASS in English 1511 GMT 27 Oct 79 LD

[Text] Moscow, October 27, TASS--The industry of the Soviet Union on the whole fulfilled the plan of the nine months of 1979 for the marketing of products. The report of the Central Statistical Board of the USSR says that the increment in industrial output was 3.4 per cent as compared with the corresponding period of last year. The average daily production increased by 3.7 per cent.

Productivity of labour rose by 2.4 per cent; about three-fourths of the increment in industrial output has been resultant of that. Profit grew.

Produced over the nine months was 904,000 million kilowatt-hours of electric power, 299,000 million cubic meters of gas, 540 million tons of coal, 13.5 million tons of steel pipes; chemical pesticides (in reference units)--363,000 tons; 3,600 million roubles worth of instruments, automation means, and spares; 2,800 million roubles worth of means of computing equipment and spares; 147 million roubles worth of oil-industry apparatus; 556 million roubles worth of chemical equipment and spares; 410,000 tractors; 2,000 million roubles worth of farm machinery; 84,200 grain harvesters; 6,800 cotton picking machines; 31,300 excavators.

The planned targets of the nine months for the production of gas, for the manufacture of instruments, means of automation and computing equipment, farm machinery, oil-industry apparatus, garments, cultural goods and household appliances, and other types of products were exceeded.

At the same time the nine month plan for the production and processing of oil, production of coal, production of ferrous finished rolled stock, mineral fertilizers, workable wood, paper, and some other types of products was underfulfilled.

The technico-economic indicators of the operation of a number of sectors and the quality of output somewhat improved. The manufacture of more than two thousand new types of products was mastered and started.

PRAVDA EDITORIAL POINTS OUT NEED TO IMPROVE MATERIAL SUPPLY WORK

LD261423 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 79 p 1 LD

[Editorial: "Production and Supply"]

[Text] Our country produces around 12 million types of products annually. It is not difficult to imagine how many raw materials, materials and batching-up articles are needed to produce them and how important it is to make more economical use of material resources. A savings of 1 percent is equivalent to a national income increase of R6 billion. This is a major reserve for fulfilling the targets of the 10th 5-Year Plan.

The main task of the statewide system of material and technical supply is to insure the efficient utilization of resources for the accelerated development of socialist production. The system's job is to supply producers with raw materials and materials in accordance with a strict timetable and scientifically substantiated normatives and to distribute the products thus created among sectors and enterprises. The 25th CPSU Congress pointed out the need to improve this system and to enhance the role and responsibility of supply organs.

Recent years have seen positive advances in this area. Direct, long-term ties between enterprises are broadening and measures have been taken in conjunction with transport workers to eliminate irrational transport operations. A number of major construction projects are being switched to the comprehensive supply of materials on the basis of orders and in accordance with demand, as determined by project estimate documents. The circulation of material resources is speeding up. However, there are still many complaints about the work of material and technical supply organs.

There are still uneven patches and even disruptions in supplies of metal, timber, cement and other very important materials. When developing plans for assigning consumers to suppliers the union main administrations for supply and marketing, which are subordinate to USSR Gossnab, sometimes arbitrarily break existing economic ties, thus disrupting production. The Balakhna pulp and paper combine, which consumes around 1.5 million cubic meters of timber each year receives only 300,000 cubic meters on the basis of direct, stable ties. For 3 years the all-union main administration for logging and timber processing has been examining the Volga-Vyatka region supply workers' suggestion that Balakhna be fully transferred to long-term ties with suppliers, but nothing has happened yet.

For a long time there has been irrational economic exchange between individual regions. Metal from the Cherepovets plant, for example, is shipped to the Ukraine and the same product is sent from Zaporozhye to Vologda, near Cherepovets. Logs are carried right across Siberia to Dagestan while the local timber in Dagestan stands rotting. Although aware of this the supply organs are not helping to improve the freight flow. Examples of this kind show that organizational irregularities abound at the junctions where supply, production and transport come into contact. To eliminate them is to bring into play new and tremendous potential for improving our economy's efficiency.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on improving the economic mechanism points out how this should be done. This document formulates a complex of measures to improve material and technical supply. USSR Gosplan and USSR Gossnab are given greater responsibility for balancing production and distribution plans and for the creation of material reserves in the national economy. A detailed program is envisaged for the development of direct, long-term economic ties and guaranteed material and technical supply on the basis of 5-year contracts between enterprises and supply organs.

The main indicators in this sphere are the volume of deliveries of resources necessary for the fulfillment of plans and also targets for reducing raw materials and materials expenditure norms. In conjunction with planning organs it is necessary to create physical balances of the distribution of output in sectors and regions in the 5-year plan and, on their basis, optimum freight flow schemes. The task now in all territorial organs and supply and marketing services is to determine specific ways of putting the new work indicators and methods into practice.

The guarantee of reliable supply is enterprises' prompt and regular delivery of the entire list of goods ordered. A rule is already operating whereby the level of incentives for economic leaders and supply workers depends directly on how far contract commitments have been met. Experience has shown that we must go further in this area. The fulfillment of deliveries will now be assessed in terms of the entire list of products. The sanctions for violating of commitments provided for by the law or contract will be employed without seeking a compromise (bez vzaimnykh zachetov). These new provisions must be unswervingly observed when they come into force.

It is necessary to create as quickly as possible a normative base for the expenditure of raw materials, materials and batching-up articles and also to develop scientifically substantiated norms for saving resources and reliable methods of forecasting demand for them. [paragraph continues]

This will make it possible to strengthen the validity and balance of production plans and better organize the distribution and fuller utilization of material assets. It is very important to strengthen supply organizations' material and technical bases and accelerate the commissioning of an automated information service on matters of material and technical production supply. The strengthening of ties among planning and supply organs, scientific institutes and industrial ministries will contribute to successes in this matter.

Party organizations are called upon to monitor the fulfillment of tasks relating to the improvement of the economic mechanism and the introduction of the system of new indicators and normatives for the supply system. It is their duty to educate cadres in the spirit of personal responsibility for diligent use of resources and to persistently overcome localistic aspirations--for example, attempts to creative aboveplan stocks. An improvement in the efficiency and quality of supply organs' work will enable production collectives to work evenly and as effectively as possible. On the eve of the 62d anniversary of Great October the party makes the following appeal:

"Working people of the Soviet Union! Strengthen labor discipline and cherish every minute of worktime! Make economical and efficient use of metal, raw materials and fuel and energy resources!"

CPSU OFFICIAL OPENS ZONAL ENERGY-SAVING CONFERENCE IN ESTONIA

LD261517 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 18 Oct 79 p 4 LD

[ETA Report: "Strict Accounting for Energy Generation and Saving"]

[Excerpt] The reliable supply of fuel, electricity and heat for the national economy and the population in the 1979-1980 fall and winter period is a very important national economic task. A zonal conference which began in Tallinn on 17 October is devoted to questions of preparing energy facilities for operation under winter conditions, taking steps to save fuel and energy resources and observing the energy consumption regime.

A. Volskiy, CPSU Central Committee deputy section chief, opened the conference; leading workers and specialists from the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification, leaders and secretaries of production association and enterprise party organizations and representatives of the party, soviet and trade union organs in the autonomous republics and oblasts of northwest RSFSR and Belorussia, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have come to participate.

GOSPLAN OFFICIAL WRITES ON METAL SAVING

LD250947 [Editorial Report LD] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 October 1979 Morning Edition carries on page two a 2,300-word article by N. Ryzhkov, first deputy chairman of USSR Gosplan, entitled "Reserves for Saving Metal" carried under the rubric "Improving the Economic Mechanism".

Ryzhkov points out that availability of metal "is limiting the development of many sectors" of the national economy and that measures must be outlined "as far as possible to overcome the metal shortage" next year and in the 11th 5-Year Plan. He suggests introducing work methods generating less metal waste, rationalization of actual metal production, the use of plastics, wood and other substitutes in construction work, better design to reduce the amount of metal needed to build machinery and preferential development of powder metallurgy, precision casting and other measures.

RADIO REPORTS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS 27-28 OCT

LD290215 [Editorial Report LD] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 27 and 28 October. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item:

27 October

The corn harvest has ended in Moldavia. Despite complicated weather conditions, a good harvest has been grown. High yields of up to 50 quintals per hectare have been harvested in areas using the industrial cultivation method. Next year this method will be used on the republic's entire corn area of 350,000 hectares. (1200 GMT)

28 October

Kokchetavskaya and Chimkentskaya oblasts have completed their grain crop sales plans. (0100 GMT)

The rice harvest has ended in Surkhandarinskaya and Tashkentskaya oblasts. So far, more than 300,000 tons of rice have been sold to the state in Uzbekistan. (0500 GMT)

CSA DATA ON GRAIN SALES IN OBLAST, ASSR

LD281640 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 28 Oct 79 LD

[Text] A report from the USSR Central Statistical Administration: The toilers of Severo-Kazakhstanskaya Oblast and the Udmurtskaya ASSR have overfulfilled their socialist pledges for sale of grain to the state. The farms of Severo-Kazakhstanskaya Oblast have sold to the state 1.514 million tons of grain, which is 205,000 tons more than planned by the general volume of the procurement plan, and 1.228 million tons of wheat--299,000 tons more than the plan. The plan for sale of barley has been overfulfilled. This is the first time that so much grain has been procured in the oblast.

The toilers of Udmurtskaya ASSR have delivered to receiving points 246,000 tons of grain and sold to the state considerably more barley than planned. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes have laid in a full supply of grain-crop seeds for next year's harvest.

While overfulfilling state plans for grain procurement, the farms of Severo-Kazakhstanskaya Oblast have failed to fulfill the plan for the sale to the state of oats and buckwheat, and the Udmurtskaya ASSR for rye, buckwheat, pulses and oats. Sale of grain to the state continues.

GRAIN HARVEST ENDS IN KAZAKHSTAN

LD290720 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 29 Oct 79 LD

[Text] The harvesting of grain crops has ended in Kazakhstan. Nearly 25 million hectares were taken up in the republic by barley and wheat. The grain crops have been threshed on all this area. The harvest campaign was not an easy one. The weather did not favor the farmers and harvesting demanded special efforts on literally every hectare. The Kazakh farmers completed the harvest with honor, bringing in the grain at the appointed time and without loss. Of the 17 oblasts in the republic, 12 produce grain; all have reported on the fulfillment of pledges. Special success fell to Tselinogradskaya Oblast.

While the Tselinograders promised to provide the country with 175 million pounds of grain, 200 million foods have been sold to date. Autumn plowing is now underway on the fields of sovkhoses and kolkhozes and the land is being prepared for the next harvest.

Details on Harvest

LD270522 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1450 GMT 26 Oct 79 LD

[Summary] Alma-Ata, 26 October, TASS--Despite poor weather, the grain harvest in the Kazakhstan steppes has been the best ever.

In Tselinogradskaya Oblast, 3.305 million tons were grown. Some 3.012 million tons of wheat (197 percent of the plan) were produced. The barley sale plan was overfulfilled.

In Alma-Atinskaya Oblast 319,000 tons of grain have been delivered. The plan for the sale of corn and barley have been "considerably overfulfilled."

Kazakhstan Agriculture Minister Mikhail Motoriko told TASS that the results were due to good equipment and enthusiasm. Everywhere between the lower Volga and the Irtysh, "the latest Soviet machines, built in the last few years" were used. Ten computer centers enabled the 100,000 combines and other machinery to be used productively. A "flying electronic laboratory" was used to determine ripeness of the wheat. At all grain reception centers equipment was used which enabled more than 500,000 tons of damp grain to be dried daily. Nearly three-fourths of the grain is of strong and firm varieties. All the virgin land farms have sufficient high-grade seed of these varieties for the next harvest.

ALIYEV PRAISES AZERBAIJAN GRAIN HARVEST AT 360,000 tons

LD290901 [Editorial Report LD] Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian on 14 October carries on pages 2 and 3 an AZERINFORM report" entitled "Rural Workers' Combat Tasks," on a 12 October Baku meeting celebrating Agricultural Workers' Day. The report contains a 5,600-word account of a speech at the meeting by G.A. Aliyev in which he lists successes in the different spheres of agriculture and describes agricultural workers' tasks for the future.

Aliyev's speech contains the following passage:

"Our republic's grain growers have worked well this year. More grain has been produced than in previous years. Some 360,000 tons of grain have been procured, socialist pledges have been overfilled and our republic has successfully met the 5-year grain delivery plan."

BRIEFS

PRIMORSKIY KRAY HARVEST--The Primorskiy Kray agricultural administration reported today that thekray has already harvested legumes from 57,000 hectares, or from a third of the entire area planted in these crops. Best results have been achieved by Yakovlevskiy Rayon, which is the first to complete harvesting of legumes. Soybean harvesting will soon be completed in Chuguyevskiy Rayon and the high rate of harvesting is being maintained in Krasnoarmeyskiy, Pogranichnyy and some other rayons. But Chernigovskiy, Mikhaylovskiy and Kirovskiy rayons are lagging behind in harvesting legumes. These three rayons have failed to harvest even one-half of the area with these crops. [Vladivostok Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 25 Oct 79 OW]